

❖ HEBRAICA. ❖

VOL. X.

APRIL—JULY, 1894.

NOS. 3 AND 4.

THE RELATION OF LEV. XX. TO LEV. XVII.-XIX.

BY PROF. LEWIS B. PATON,

Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

The similarities of diction between Lev. xx. and the portion of the Holiness Code which immediately precedes it (xvii.-xix.) are so obvious and so numerous that they must form the starting point of any investigation into the literary history of this section of the legislation. Characteristic expressions of H which both have in common are as follows,—**אבת** familiar spirits (xix. 31; xx. 6, 27), **איש איש** whosoever (xvii. 3, 8, 10, 13; xviii. 6; xx. 2, 9), **אני יהוה אלהיך** I am Yahweh thy God (xviii. 2, 5, 30; xix. 3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36; xx. 7), **מבית ישראל** of the house of Israel (xvii. 3, 8, 10; xx. 2 in Sam. and Heb. codices), **גלות ערוה** uncover the nakedness (xviii. 6-18; xx. 11, 18, 19, 20, 21), **הלך בחקת** walk in the statutes (xviii. 3, 4; xx. 23), **זמה** infamy (xviii. 17; xix. 29; xx. 14), **זנה אחר** go whoring after (xvii. 7; xx. 5, 6), **חלל** **את-שם אלהיך** profane the name of thy God (xviii. 21; xix. 12; xx. 3), **חקת ומשפטים** statutes and judgments (xviii. 4, 5, 26; xix. 37; xx. 22), **טמא** to pollute (xviii. 28; xx. 3), **ידענים** spirits of divination (xix. 31; xx. 6, 27), **והכרתיו אותו** and I will cut him off (xvii. 10; xx. 3, 5), **לבלתי** in order that (xviii. 30; xx. 4), **מקדשי** my sanctuary (xix. 30; xx. 3), **משכבים** intercourse (xviii. 22; xx. 13), **נשא עון** bear sin (xvii. 16; xix. 8; xx. 17, 19), **מקרב עמו** from the midst of his kin (xvii. 4, 10; xviii. 29; xx. 3, 5, 6, 18), **פנה אל** pay regard to (xix. 4, 31; xx. 6), **ונתתי פני** and I will set my face (xvii. 10; xx. 3, 6), **קדשים תהיו** ye shall be holy (xix. 2; xx. 7, 26), **כי קדוש אני** for I am holy (xix. 2; xx. 26), **קיא** to vomit (xviii. 25, 28; xx. 22), **קלל** to curse (xix. 14; xx. 9), **קרב אל** draw near unto a woman (xviii. 6, 19; xx. 16), **רבע** gender (xviii. 23; xix. 19; xx. 16), **רעה** fellow (xix. 13, 16, 18;

xx. 10), **שֹׂר** flesh = near kin (xviii. 12, 13, 17; xx. 19), **נָתַן שְׂכֵנְתְּךָ** give thy issue (xviii. 20, 23; xx. 15), **שָׁמַר וַעֲשֵׂה** observe and do (xviii. 4, 26, 30; xix. 37; xx. 8, 22), **תְּבִלָּה** confusion (xviii. 23; xx. 12) **הוּא תוֹעֵבָה הַזֶּה** it is abomination (xviii. 22; xx. 13).

In view of the remarkable correspondence of the diction of this chapter with that of the preceding chapters, there would be no doubt in the mind of any critic that it was an integral part of the Holiness Code, but for the following facts. 1. It contains no new legislation but simply traverses the ground already gone over in Lev. xvii.-xix. and in Lev. xi., a fragment of the Holiness legislation which has been dislocated from its original connection with Lev. xvii.-xix. The correspondence of the laws is as follows,—xx. 2-5 = xviii. 21; xx. 6 = xix. 31; xx. 9 = xix. 3; xx. 10 = xviii. 20; xx. 11 = xviii. 8; xx. 12 = xviii. 15; xx. 13 = xviii. 22; xx. 14 = xviii. 17; xx. 15 = xviii. 23a; xx. 16 = xviii. 23b; xx. 17 = xviii. 9; xx. 18 = xviii. 19; xx. 19 = xviii. 12 sq.; xx. 20 = xviii. 14; xx. 21 = xviii. 16; xx. 22 sq. = xviii. 3 sq.; xx. 25 = Lev. xi. 2-23, 41-45; xx. 27 = xix. 31.

The traditional exegesis has pronounced Lev. xx. to be the enactment of the penalties which are to be visited upon the offences enumerated in Lev. xvii.-xix. If this were true, it would possibly explain the singular repetition of the legislation; but even then one might ask, why the penalties were not inserted in immediate connection with the laws, instead of waiting until the legislation was completed and then repeating it with the penalties. The threat of cutting off is combined with the law in xvii. 4, 9, 10, 14; why is it not combined with the law in xx. 5, 6, 17, 18? It is not the fact, however, that xx. gives the penalties of the laws in xvii.-xix. As Graf first pointed out (*Geschichtliche Bücher des A. T.* p. 77), this chapter is in no sense a code of penalties to be visited upon the offender by the nation. In five cases, that of keeping God's statutes (v. 8), marriage with one's mother's sister (v. 19a), marriage with one's father's sister (v. 19b), distinguishing between clean and unclean beasts and fowl (v. 25a), and eating of creeping things (v. 25b), no penalty whatever is prescribed. These laws are no less important than the rest of the group, and if it had been the intention of the writer to give a code of penalties parallel to the foregoing legislation, he would not have omitted the sanctions here. In seven cases no obligation is laid upon Israel to punish the offender, but Yahweh himself declares that he will intervene in judgment. He will "set his face against the man" and will "cut him off from the midst of his kinsfolk" (vs. 4, 5, 6). "They shall be cut off," i. e. by divine intervention (vs. 17, 18). "They shall be childless" (vs. 20, 21). All of the crimes which are accompanied with these threatenings are of such a nature as to call for the exercise of human penal authority and no reason can be given why the writer should not have said, "they shall surely be put to death," as in

other cases, if his aim had been to give a code of penalties. The threatening of divine judgment is in no true sense a penalty but is rather an exhortation to obedience.

In seven cases it is said that the offender shall be put to death (vs. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16), but it is not stated how death is to be inflicted, nor is any distinction made between the crimes, which are of very different degrees of heinousness; so that the formula really furnishes no guide to the judges in any individual case and, therefore, cannot be called a penalty in a strict sense of the word. As Graf very properly observes, "In all these cases, as in the declaration that the offenders shall be cut off from their people, we have no discrimination of civil penalties or of gradation in the various crimes, but only the expression of moral abhorrence towards the respective offences and of the curse which transgressors of the divine will bring down upon themselves."

In two cases stoning is prescribed (vs. 2, 27), and in one (v. 14) burning; these are the only true penalties in the chapter. How little emphasis the author lays upon them, is evident from the fact, that in v. 6 he threatens with divine visitation the same offence which in v. 27 he threatens with stoning. These three crimes are not as flagrant as many of the others, and that they should be provided with specific sanctions, is quite fortuitous.

Again, if it were the purpose of Lev. XX. to give the penalties for the offences enumerated in the foregoing chapters, how does it happen that some of the most grievous of those offences are omitted from the list? Although the rest of the laws of Lev. XVIII. are given, those in regard to marriage with one's mother, granddaughter, and wife's sister are not mentioned. Is that because the author did not regard them as sufficiently important to call for the enactment of a penalty? Why is the consulting of familiar spirits and spirits of divination alone singled out from XIX. to be threatened with punishment, while all the other sins against the majesty of Yahweh remain unnoticed? This is inexplicable if the writer of XX. intended to give the penalties for the offences just enumerated in XVII.-XIX.

Accordingly, it is clear that XX. is in no sense a code of sanctions to the foregoing legislation. It is not supplementary to XVII.-XIX. but parallel to it. It simply gives in another form the legislation which has just been traversed and enlarges it with a variety of motives for obedience. This fact makes it difficult to think that XX. is an integral part of the Holiness legislation or that the original author of XVII.-XIX. has written this chapter.

2. Another reason for doubting that XX. was originally connected with XVII.-XIX. is found in the difference of the structure of this chapter from those which precede it. The methodical and logical treatment of the legislation in XVII.-XIX., apart from obvious glosses, such as XIX. 20-22, is one of its most marked characteristics. The precepts follow one another in the natural order of thought and are

so grouped as to exhaust one subject before another is taken up. In Lev. xx., however, confusion reigns supreme. The laws make the impression of having been thrown together without any plan. The sequence is, Molech-worship, sorcery, cursing father and mother, then various sexual crimes, clean and unclean meats, and sorcery a second time. The only suggestion of plan in this combination is that the sexual crimes are grouped together (vs. 10-21), but within this group the same confusion prevails as throughout the rest of the chapter. In xviii. the order is perfect and the commandments fall into their respective groups with mathematical precision. xviii. 6-10 treats of relationships of the first degree; 11-15, of relationships of the second degree; 16-19, of relationships through marriage; 20-24, of purity outside of the family; and the whole is followed by a hortatory address, 25-30. Here in xx. most of these commandments are given again, but we search in vain for any principle of classification. Can we believe that the two codes come from the same hand?

3. Not only is this chapter unmethodical in structure but it is characterized by a diffuseness of style which is quite foreign to the preceding chapters. The author of xvii-xix. wastes no words. He states his laws in a compact form and, if he gives a sanction or a reason, gives but one and that as brief as possible. This writer, however, piles up after the several precepts a variety of exhortations to obedience and threatens two or more judgments which shall fall upon the transgressor. Notice how in vs. 9, 11, 12, 13, 16 the words "Their (his) blood shall be upon them (him)" are attached to the direction "They (he) shall surely be put to death," although this phrase adds nothing to the thought. In v. 12 there is a triple comment, "They shall surely be put to death: they have wrought confusion: their blood shall be upon them" (cf. v. 14). So also in v. 16, "Thou shalt kill the woman and the beast: they shall surely be put to death: their blood shall be upon them." In vs. 2-5 the writer threatens the Molech-worshipper with death, and then adds, "The people of the land shall stone him with stones." Not satisfied with this emphasis, he threatens him also with cutting off by God, regardless of the fact that if the judgment already pronounced be executed, this is an impossibility; and finally, he extends the sentence to the family of the man and to all who aid and abet him in his wickedness. This is quite analogous to the redundant style which we have found already in this chapter and needs no theory of a combination of documents to explain it (against Dillmann, Baentsch). Similarly in v. 10 the tautology, "A man who commits adultery with the wife of a man," and "He who commits adultery with the wife of his fellow," does not demand the assumption of two sources (Dillmann), but is simply one more instance of the author's redundancy of style. The same sort of a double expression of a single idea is found in 10a, 17b, 18a, but in none of these cases does Dillmann assume two sources for the text. Verse 27 also is probably only another instance of the author's love of amplification and disre-

gard of order. Wishing to lay special emphasis upon the evil of consulting familiar spirits and spirits of divination, and feeling that he had not said all that was possible in v. 6, he returns to the subject in v. 27 and adds to the previous threat of extermination by the intervention of God, "They shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them," a sentence which is quite as redundant as any that we have met hitherto. The style of XX., accordingly, is very different from the direct and terse style of the code in XVII.-XIX., so different, in fact, that it is difficult to believe that both are the composition of the same author.

4. In spite of all the similarities of diction between Lev. XX. and the legislation of H which precedes it, there are some remarkable differences which deserve to be noted carefully. Most striking of all is the regular use of the introductory formula **איש איש** (vs. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, cf. **הנפש אשר** v. 6), which is found nowhere else in the Holiness Code. Another peculiarity, which runs through the entire chapter, is the use of the phrase **רמיו בו**, "His blood shall be upon him," or, "Their blood shall be upon them" (vs. 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 27). The expression, with the addition of **יהיה**, is found in Ezek. XVIII. 13 but does not occur in the Hexateuch outside of Lev. XX. The different formula of XVII. 4, "Blood shall be imputed to that man," is worthy of notice. Neither of the expressions, "In Israel," or "The people of the land" (vs. 2, 4), are used elsewhere in H. The phrase, "Hide the eyes from," is not found in H nor anywhere else in the Hexateuch.

Other cases of verbal difference from XVII.-XIX. are as follows; the construction of **נפש** as a masculine in v. 6 (in XVII. 10, 15; XVIII. 29 it is treated as a feminine), the use of **טמא** in the sense of "regard as unclean," as in P, instead of "defile," as in H (Lev. XI. 44; XVIII. 28).

Even where this author is closest to the style of XVII.-XIX. he shows a freedom in the use of the phrases in question which is not found in those chapters. For instance, he not only says, **ואני אתן את-פני באיש ההוא**, "And I will give my face against that man," which is the regular form in the previous chapters; but he modifies this into, **ושמתי את-פני באיש ההוא**, which is not found elsewhere in H. He not only says, "I will cut him off," "And that man shall be cut off," forms which the preceding chapters employ, but he says also, "They shall be cut off in the sight of the children of their people," an expression which is unique in the Hexateuch. Besides the expressions of the purity laws in XVIII., in this shorter parallel we find the additional phrases, **יקח** (v. 10), **ינאף את-** (v. 14), **ראה את-ערוה** (v. 17), **הערה את-מקרה** (v. 18), **את-שארו הערה** (v. 19), **חסד הוא** (v. 17), **תבל עשו** (v. 12). These instances show that the similarity of diction, upon which we commented at the outset, is only superficial and that the writer of XX. has really a much more copious vocabulary than the writer of XVII.-XIX.

Furthermore, there is an absence of certain constantly recurring expressions of xvii.-xix. from xx. which is surprising if these chapters come from the same hand. **אני יהוה**, without any added words, is a closing formula which runs through all the holiness legislation; but, curiously enough, it is absent from this chapter. The words **עמית** neighbor and **אחך** thy brother, which are so frequent elsewhere in H, are also wanting, although there is nothing in the contents to hinder the use of them. The characteristic expression **לטמאה** "for defilement" (xviii. 20, 23; xix. 31; xxii. 5), which would be most appropriate in this context, is also wanting.

In view of all these facts it must be admitted, I think, that it is improbable that Lev. xx. was written by the author of Lev. xvii.-xix.

In this conclusion the majority of modern critics are agreed, but in the explanation which they give of the peculiar relation between these passages they differ widely from one another. The main theories which are proposed are the following.

1. Graf (*Geschichtliche Bücher*, p. 77) recognizes fully the weight of the considerations which make it impossible to regard Lev. xx. as originally connected with xvii.-xix., and seeks to explain the similarities of style by the hypothesis that it was written by the author of xvii.-xix. at a later time and under different historical conditions.

With this theory the facts enumerated above are as inconsistent as they are with the theory that xx. is the original continuation of xvii.-xix. No reason can be given why an author who had already published a complete legislation should repeat the same at a later time in a fragmentary form. Even if we grant that he might have done so, we cannot see why he should abandon in his new code the logical method and orderly arrangement of his former code. This theory fails also to explain why, in treating of precisely the same subjects as in the earlier legislation, he should change his terse and direct style into a diffuse and repetitious one, or why he should give up so many of his habitual expressions and make constant use of others which he never employed in his earlier code.

2. Wellhausen (*Composition d. Hexateuchs*, p. 157), Baentsch (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, p. 31), and most of the Grafian school hold that the kernel of Lev. xx., the legislation in vs. 10-21, is drawn from a code which was originally independent of Lev. xviii. and that it owes its present position to the writer of xx. 2-5, 22 sq., who is the editor of the whole code.

This theory explains the doubling of the legislation of Lev. xviii. in Lev. xx., but it fails to explain the close correspondence in thought and language between the assumed kernel and its assumed doublet. If xx. 10-21 was originally independent of xviii., how does it happen that it contains not one law which is not found in xviii.? One can see how a second code treating of the same subject should in large measure contain the same commandments, but one

cannot see how, if it were independent in its origin, it should not contain at least a few laws not found in its doublet. Baentsch attempts to evade this argument by assuming that the editor of xx. has supplemented all deficiencies in the kernel out of its doublet in xviii. and omitted from it everything that was different from xviii. This, however, is a purely arbitrary assumption, which has nothing in its favor except that it bolsters up Baentsch's theory of the relation of the codes.

Again, the similarity of the diction of this chapter with those which precede it is against any hypothesis of strict literary independence. If these similarities were confined to the paraenetic setting, as it is called, and the central code were different, then this theory would be the most probable one, but it is not the fact. If one will examine the list of verbal and phraseological similarities given at the beginning of this article, one will see at a glance that the similarities are quite as great and quite as numerous in the code as in the so-called "setting." These similarities are not of the nature of redactional amplifications, so that one might conjecture that the editor of the whole had added them at the time of his incorporation of the code, but they are woven into the fundamental structure of the laws and must have belonged to their first draft.

Wellhausen's suggestion that similarity of standpoint and nearness of time of origin will explain this verbal correspondence is insufficient, for there is more here than a mere general correspondence of language. In many instances there is an exact verbal correspondence between the supposed doublets, and this points to a closer connection between the documents than that they have originated in the same age or have made use of the same oral tradition. xx. 11 agrees with xviii. 8 in using the indefinite expression **אשת-אבִיךָ**, wife of thy father, for step-mother and also in the peculiar application of the expression, "uncover the nakedness," to the father who is dishonored as well as to the woman, to whom alone it is strictly appropriate. In xx. 13 and in its parallel, xviii. 22, we find the identical phrases, **ישכב את-זכר**, and **משכבי אשה**, neither of which are usual. More remarkable still, the comment upon the offence, that it is **תועבה** "abomination," is found in both passages. The very peculiar language of xviii. 23 **לא תתן שכבתך** and **רבע** reappears in xx. 15, 16. The nearer definition of sister by the words, "The daughter of thy father or the daughter of thy mother," which can hardly be said to be necessary to the sense, is found both in xx. 17 and in xviii. 9. The extraordinary use of **גלות ערוה** in the case of a wife in xviii. 19 is followed also in xx. 18.

xx. 19 and xviii. 12sq. agree in speaking of the aunt as "the sister of the father or the sister of the mother," and both annex the peculiar reason, not found in other cases, that she is **שאר** "near kin." xx. 20 and xviii. 14 both speak of the uncle's wife as **דרה** and pronounce marriage with her an uncovering of the uncle's nakedness (cf. also xx. 21 and xviii. 16). These verbal coin-

cidences cannot be accidental and they make it impossible to believe that Lev. xviii. and Lev. xx. are independent of one another in their literary origin. This is precisely the same sort of verbal similarity with the preceding legislation which we find in those portions of chapter xx. which enclose the laws about sexual purity. Whatever explanation we give to the similarities of diction in the setting, we must give also to the similarities of the kernel in vs. 10-21, for they are identical in kind. If vs. 2-9, 22-27 are to be ascribed to the collector of the entire Holiness Code, over against the original author of the legislation in xvii.-xix., then vs. 10-12 must also be ascribed to the same hand.

Another objection to this theory is that vs. 10-21 do not, after all, form a code in any strict sense of the word. The characteristic absence of direct address (noted by Wellhausen himself, *Composition*, p. 158) is evidence against its ever having been intended to circulate as a code, inasmuch as elsewhere direct address is one of the most marked features of Hebrew legislation. Its incompleteness also makes it improbable that it ever existed as an independent document. The prohibition of marriage with one's mother, daughter, granddaughter, sister, and wife's sister are wanting from the group. The first four of these offences are perhaps the worst that could arise. Can that be called a code which has nothing to say about such weighty matters? Of course it is possible to say that laws on these subjects once stood in the group and have been omitted by the editor, but it is impossible to prove this assertion. That a later compiler should have singled out these cases above all others for omission, is exceedingly improbable.

The lack of order in the commandments, which we have already noticed, is also against regarding this group of precepts as a code. If it had been published as such, it seems almost necessary that it should be cast into some form which would appeal to the logical faculty and to the memory. In absence of this, it seems to me unlikely that it ever existed as a separate document.

One more argument may be urged against regarding 10-21 as a fragment of an independent code. If we do so, we must also regard the precepts in vs. 2-9, 22-27 as extracts from codes which were parallel to H, for, as we have seen already, these sections do not stand in any different literary relation to H from that of vs. 10-21. That is to say, we must assume a doublet or set of doublets, parallel not only to Lev. xviii., but parallel also to xix. and to xi. 2-23, 41-47. Baentsch (p. 31) actually does this, but it is a difficult hypothesis. It is possible that a doublet to xviii. may have existed, but it is scarcely probable that a doublet existed to the entire legislation of H which precedes chapter xx., a doublet which corresponded so closely that not a single law stood in it which did not stand in the other legislation. If we are not willing to make this assumption for the entire chapter, we have no right to make it for vs. 10-21.

3. Dillmann attempts to explain the relation of Lev. xx. to xvii.-xix. by the application of his peculiar theory of a J recension of H along with a P

recension of H. Chapter XX., according to him, has been drawn by the editor from J's redaction of the original H, while XVIII. and the other parallels are drawn from P's redaction.

This theory evidently meets the objections just urged against Wellhausen's theory of originally independent documents for XVIII.-XIX. and XX., for, according to it, the documents are not independent but go back to a common primitive source. If the source of Lev. XX. was simply another recension of the same code which underlies Lev. XI. and XVIII.-XIX., it is natural enough that this chapter should contain no new legislation and that it should have many points of similarity of diction with them. The great difficulty, however, in this theory is the absence of any proof of the existence of two such recensions apart from the fact that we find these parallel groups of laws. There is nothing to show that XX. comes from a J recension except that certain expressions of J occur in this chapter, but that is the case in XVIII. also. In both chapters these phrases are found in the hortatory comments only, and they prove no more than that one of the editors of H was acquainted with the history of J. If the characteristics of J were woven into the legislation of XX., the theory of a J recension would be probable, but this is not the case. The coincidences with J are redactional elements superimposed upon the legislation here precisely as they are superimposed upon XVIII. and upon the rest of the code.

Again chapter XVIII. contains nothing which suggests that its legislation has passed through a redaction at the hands of P. The only argument which Dillmann is able to make in support of this theory is as follows (Ex.-Lev. p. 541, "In den Gesetzen selbst, die in der Hauptsache sehr alt sind, findet sich kein Zeichen, um die Quelle sicher zu bestimmen. Jedoch, da in XX. 8-24 R den Text des C (= J) zu Grund gelegt hat, ist wahrscheinlich, dass er XVIII. 6-20. A (= P) folgte, für welchen ohnedem die systematische Ordnung und Vollständigkeit spricht, aber vs. 21-23 aus C excerpt hat.") That is to say, Dillmann assigns the legislation in XVIII. to P because he must give that in XX. to J and has no other editor left to whom he may assign it. There are no linguistic marks pointing to the redactional hand of P, and the only indication of style is the systematic arrangement; but the original H is always systematic, even in those sections which Dillmann assigns to the J recension, and, therefore, this cannot be claimed as a peculiarity which is due to the influence of P. Besides this, it is a great weakness in Dillmann's theory, that he is compelled to cut out of the midst of XVIII. laws which are an integral part of its legislation (vs. 21-23) because they show the same standpoint as the supposed J recension in XX. This criticism seems to me exceedingly arbitrary. The fine logical development of thought in XVIII., and the regular arrangement of its legislation in groups, point to a unity of source; but Dillmann rejects these evidences and then, without any evidence, supposes P to have recast the legislation in XVIII., although not one of

his characteristic phrases occurs, and although the whole subject of the legislation is alien to his spirit.

The relation of xviii. to xx. is the stronghold of the theory that the present form of the Holiness Code has arisen through the combination of two recensions of a primitive H, and if it breaks down here, there is little hope of carrying it through elsewhere in the code. The supposed extracts from parallel codes in xix. and other parts of H can, I think, all be shown to be nothing more than glosses or accidental transpositions of laws which stand in their right connection elsewhere in the code; they lend, therefore, no support to the hypothesis that H once existed in a double form.

Not finding that any of the theories just enumerated are satisfactory, we are shut up, it seems to me, to the hypothesis that Lev. xx. is a hortatory commentary on the foregoing code in xvii.-xix. This hypothesis will explain, I believe, all of the phenomena in the case and it is the only one which will do so. That chapter xx. contains no legislation which is not found in the preceding chapters, is due to the fact that its author had H before him when he wrote and simply worked over given material. That many of the laws of xvii.-xix. are left out in xx. is due to the fact that its author had already retained these laws from his sources in xvii.-xix. and therefore, did not feel compelled to insert them here. Theoretical completeness is not what he aims at in this chapter, but rather the emphasizing of certain laws which were peculiarly liable to be violated in his time. The lack of order in the precepts of xx. is due to the fact that the writer's aim was exhortation and not legislation, so that it was quite immaterial in what succession he enumerated the duties. The redundant style is precisely what we should expect in one who made a selection of old laws a basis for his homily and whose chief aim was to impress the conscience.

The many similarities of diction with xvii.-xix. are due to the fact that the author of xx. was thoroughly familiar with the contents and language of the document which he was annotating and intentionally imitated it. That they are not signs of identity of authorship but rather of quotation, is evidenced by the circumstance that they are not spontaneous expressions of the writer of xx. and are not always used intelligently by him. For instance, xvii.-xix. threatens that God will cut a man off from his kinsfolk in cases where the offence is of such a nature that it would not naturally come to the cognizance of the civil authorities, but in xx. 3 the threat is appended to the sin of sacrificing children to Molech, which is in no sense a private offence, and this shows that the writer has mechanically adopted this phrase without observing its exact use in his source.

The closing formula, "I am Yahweh your God," is used throughout xvii.-xix. to mark the logical divisions of the code into its groups of laws, in xx., however, it is employed entirely indiscriminately.

Another indication that the similarity of diction is due to quotation is found in the fact, that the writer of this chapter feels the necessity of explaining expressions which he has borrowed from the original code. A case of this sort is seen in v. 11, where the expression, "uncover the nakedness of one's father," is used precisely as in xviii. 8, and yet the author feels it necessary to interpret this by the added clause, "lie with the wife of one's father" (cf. vs. 20, 21). Notice also how in xx. 23 the writer uses יְנִי in dependence upon xviii. 24, but so soon as he begins to write of his own accord in the following verses, abandons it for עֵמִים.

It seems to me, therefore, that the mere comparison of the more striking similarities of the diction of this chapter with that of chapters xvii.-xix., apart from any other facts, favors the theory that the writer of this chapter is an imitator.

The differences of the diction of this chapter from xvii.-xix. need no comment, for if this chapter be the work of an annotator of the original legislation, it is only natural that, along with quotation and imitation of the document before him, he should also show variations due to his own peculiar style.

If space permitted, it would be possible, I think, to show that Lev. xx. comes from the same hand which has added the hortatory amplifications in Lev. xviii. 25-30; xxv. 18-22, and probably also in Lev. xxvi. The proof, however, cannot be given in this article. I must content myself with having shown that Lev. xx. is not an extract from an independent code, or even an independent recension, but that it is an hortatory address written by a later editor with the primitive holiness legislation as his text.

A CRITICAL COPY OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH WRITTEN IN A. D. 1232.

BY REV. W: SCOTT WATSON, A. M.,

Towerhill (Guttenberg P. O.), N. J.

IV. COLLATION.

The printed text of the Samaritan Pentateuch with which the codex has been compared is that of Blayney's "Pentateuchus Hebraeo-Samaritanus Characteres Hebraeo-Chaldaico." (The verses are referred to as they are there numbered.) The editor professes to give an exact reprint of the text of the London Polyglot.

The results have been gathered into ten tables, as follows:

Table I.—General collation and index to the other tables;

Table II.—Two readings actually given;

Table III.—Places where ך is omitted from the middle of a word but its insertion is indicated for a secondary reading;

Table IV.—Places where ך is found in the middle of a word but its omission is indicated for a secondary reading;

Table V.—Places where ך is omitted from the middle of a word but its insertion is indicated for a secondary reading;

Table VI.—Places where ך is found in the middle of a word but its omission is indicated for a secondary reading;

Table VII.—Places where secondary readings other than those included in the preceding tables are indicated;

Table VIII.—Interlineations and other additions made after the first writing;

Table IX.—Erasures and changes made in whole or in part by erasure;

Table X.—Places where the text of the codex is lost.

TABLE I.

GENESIS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
1 1 to 3:19.	See Table X.	4 4 מנחמו מנחתו	
3 20 אדם האדם		7 לא תטיב לפתח לא תטיב לפתח	
21 כיתנות	IV. כיתנו(ו)ת.	" תטיב לפתח	{ Both words omitted. }
24 להט לחט			
4 2 רעה רעי		10 דמי דם	
4 ומחלביהן	VII.	12 תוסף תוסף	

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
4 12 (2d) את	תת	8 22 והרף	וחרף
“ כחה	III. כ*חה	9 6 אדם	האדם
18 וילד	וילד	12 לדרת	לדרות
“ מיחאל	מחיאל	15 לשחית	להשחית
23 אמרתי	V. אמ*רתי	17-19	X.
25 וידע	IX.	10 2 ומושך	מושך
5 19, 28-30, 32	X.	3 ריפד	ריפת
32 (2d) את	ואת	4 ותרשיש	X. תרשי[ש].
6 1 כי	X.	5, 6	X.
2 טובת	טובות See also IX.	10 וכלהן	וכלנה
4 הגברים	III. הגב*רים	13 לודים	לדים
4-7	X.	15 חת	VII.
7 ששיתים	VI. עשית(י)ם	23 חוץ	עוץ
8-10	X.	26 חצרמות	חצרימות
10 (2d) את	ואת	27 איזל	עיזל
11-13	X.	29 חוילה	החוילה
13 משחיתים	VI. משחית(י)ם	11 4-23	X.
14 עשי	עשה	26 ויוליד	V. ויול*ד
14-17	X.	“ את (2d)	ואת
17 לשחית	להשחית	27 “ “	“
18 ובאת, ונשי	X.	29 אררם	אברם
19 להיות	לחיות	30 ילד	V. יל*ד
19-22	X.	12 5 ארץ	ארצה
7 1-8, 10, 11	X.	9 הלך	הלוך
11 נפתחה	נפתחו	12 אתיך	VI. את(י)ך
12 היה	ויהי	13 אחתי	III. אח*תי
17 “	“	“ בעבורך	בעבוריך
“ מעל	X.	“ בגללך	בגלליך
19 הגבהים	הגבחים	15 ביתה	VII.
21-23	X.	16 עבדים	VII.
23 הישאר	וישאר	“ וחמרים	III. וחמ*רים
24 ויגברו, יום	X.	19 אחתי	. III. אח*תי
8 1 המים	X.	13 2 בכסף	ובכסף
2 ויכלא	ויכל	6 יחרו	יחרו
2-9, 17	X.	8 אבבם	אברם
19 הרמש	הרמש הרמש	9 (2d) השמאלה	והשמאלה
21 וירח	VI. ויר(י)ח	18 וילך	ויאל
“(1st & 2d) אוסף	אוסף	14 1 ואריוך	VII.
22 קר	קור	2 ושמאבר	ושם אבר
“ וחום	וחם	“ צבאים	צבואים

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
14 2	היא	IX. 17 9	לדרותם
5	בהם	VII. 9-12	X.
"	בשוה	VII. 12	לדורתים
8	צבאים	III. 13, 15	X.
"	היא	VII. 16	IX.
9	ואמרפל	19-21	X.
13	היגר	21	האחרת
14	נשבה	22, 23	X.
17	השוה	VII. 24	בהמולו
24	אשכול	VII. 25	X. בהמולו]
15 1	שכרך	18 2	אנשים
4	ממעיד	6	סאים
"	יירשך	6, 7, 9	X.
7	הוצאתיך	VIII. 13	האמנם.
8	אירשנה	19 (1st & 2d)	אברהם
10	בתור	VIII. 20	X.
"	בטרו	21	הכצקתה
"	הצפרים	III. 22	האנשים
13	ידע	25 (1st)	חלילה
14	יעבדו	"	השפט
15	אבתך	III. 33	שב
"	ותקבר	19 2	ויאמר
16	ישוב	IX. 5	האנשים
16 6	בידך	6	X.
"	עשי	8	אוציא
8	אוי	9	VII.
"	באתי	"	לגור
9	והתענה	"	ש* פת
10	זרעך	VI. 16	ויוצאהו
11	הניך	V. 17	ויניחהו
"	עניך	V. 17	תבט
12	והוא	"	VII.
"	פרי	20	IX.
14	ראי	VII. 23	ותחיה
16	ית	23	יצא
17 4	אני	26	IX.
6	במאד	IX. 26	נציב
"	ומלכים	IX. 28	VII.
7	לדרתם	29	בשחית
9	ויאשר	32	אבינו

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
19 33 ותשקיהן	ותשקיהנה	23 8 מתי	מיתי (VI.?)
34 נשקנו	נשקינו	9 קרב	קבר
35 ותשקיהן	ותשקיהנה	11 מתך	מ(י)תך VI.
20 2 אחתי	אח*תי III.	13 מתי	מיתי
3 אודת	אדות	15 מתך	מיתך
5 אחתי	אח*תי III.	18 בעי	באי
7 השב	הש(י)ב VI.	24 8 אחקריך	אחרוך
8 כל	IX.	" משבעתי	משבועתי
9 יעשון	יעשון	12 ויאמר	IX.
12 האמנם	אמנם	13 נצב	נציב
" אחתי	אחותי	" יצאות	יצאת
13 חסרך	חסר(י)ך VI.	14 הטי	הטני
16 לאחריך	לאח(י)ך VI.	" נא	The word omitted.
" לך	ל*ך V.	" כריך	כריך (VI.?)
" אתיך	את(י)ך VI.	17 מכריך	מכריך
21 7 הינקה	IX.	18 ותורד	ותוריד
11 אודת	אדות	20 "	"
14 שים	שם	" הביר	הבאר
16 הרחיקה	הרחקה	28 ותגיד	ותג(י)ד VI.
" כמטחוי	VIII.	30 אחתו (1st)	אחותו
17 מליך	מלכי	" (2d) do.	אח*תו III.
18 וחזקי	והחזקי	35 גמלים	וגמלים
" ידיך	יד*ך V.	37 וישבעני	וישביעני
21 פארן	פראן	38 כי אם לא	כי אם
22 ופי כל	As one word.	42 ואבוא	ואב*א III.
25 ויוכיח	והוכיח	43 נצב	נציב
29 לאברהם	אברהם	" השקני	השקיני
32 ופי כל	As one word.	45 ותרד	X.
" וישבו	וישובו	" השקני	השקיני
33 העולם	עולם	" מכרך	מכר(י)ך VI.
22 2 יחידאך	יחידך VII.	46 ותורד	ותור(י)ד VI.
5 נלכה	VII.	" השקתה	VII.
9 ועצים	העצים	49 ישכם	X.
12 יחידאך	יחידך	50 לא	X.
16 "	"	51 ותהי	ותהיה
21 בכרו	בכורו	51-54	X.
24 האת	ואת	56 ויהוה	X.
23 3 מתי	מיתי	59 אחתם	אחותם
4 "	מ(י)תי VI.	" אברהם	X.
6 מתך (1st)	מיתך		

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
24 60	אחתנו	27 13	אך
61-67	X.	15	החמדות
25 3	הוליד	“	ותלב(י)ש VI.
“	ולטשים	19	בכורך
4	VII.	“	שבה
“	חנוך	21	ואמ*שך III.
8	IX.	22	וימשהו
11	VII.	27	ויר*ח V.
12	המצרית	28	IX.
15	נפיש	“	IX.
16	ובטיר*תם III.	“	ותירש
17	וימת	31	ויעש
23	VIII.	32	בכ*רך III.
25	אדמוני III.	35, 36	X.
27	ויעקב	39	ומטל
29	ויזר	45	שוב
30	העלטני	45, 46	X.
“	האד*ם III.	28 6	VII.
“	“	11, 12	X.
31	בכר*תך III.	13	נציב
32	בכ*רה III.	18	מראישתו
33	בכורתו	20	יעקב
34	הבכורה	21, 22	X.
26 3	השב*עה III.	29 2	רביצים
5	חקותי	7	IX.
“	ותורותי	10	אמו
9	אח*תי III.	12	ותגיד
“	אמות	13	אח*תו III.
13	IX.	“	ויביאהו
18	וישב	16	VIII.
21	אחרת	21	הבא
22	“	26	במקומנו
“	רחבות	34	ילוח
26	As one word.	“	אלי
31	IX.	35	אורה
33	על כן	30 1	הבא
35	ותהינה	2	ממעיד
27 8	מצויה	8	אח*תי III.
12	ימו(י)שני IV.	“	את
“	VIII.	13	אשורני

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
30 14 דוראים	רורים	31 10 עקרים	עקורים
" מדוראי	VII.	" נקרים	נקרים
15 קחתך	VI. קחת(י)ך	" וברדים	וברורים
" ולקחת	ולקחתי	12 עקרים	III. עק*דים
" עמ"ך	VI. עמ(י)ך	" נקרים	נקורים
" דוראי	רורי	" וברדים	וברורים
16 בדוראי	ברורי	15 נכריות	כנכריות
20 זבולן	זבלון	" מכבנו	מכרנו
26 ילדי	ילדי	19 לגז	III. לג*ז
31 ארעי	ארעה	27 ובכנר	IV. ובכנ(ו)ר
32 אעברה	IX.	31 כה	כי
" הסיר	VI. הס(י)ר	" בנותיך	בנתיך
" הטלוא	וטלוא	33 ויחפש	ויחפש
35 העקרים	העקורים	35 "	"
" והטלאים	III. והטל*אים	41 בנתיך	III. בנ*תיך
" הנקודות	הנקודות	42 ויוכיח	והוכיח
36 עקרים	(III.?) עק*דים	47 שחדותה	שחדותה
" נקרים	נקורים	" גלעד	גל עד
" וברדים	וברורים	48 "	" "
" ואיטיב	ואיטב	53 ישפט ביננו	IX.
37 וערמון	II.	55 וישוב	וישב
" ברהטים	ברחטים	32 7 וישבו	IV. ויש(ו)בו
38 תבאהן	תבאנה	10 ולמולדתך	ואל מולדתך
" בבאהן	בבאנה	13 אטיב	איטיב
39 נקרים	נקורים	31 פנו אל	As one word(?).
" וטלאים	וטלואים	33 1 הילדים	חילידים
41 ישם	ישים	2 ילידיהן	ילידהן
" ברהטים	ברחטים	" וילדיה	וילידיה
42 ישם	ישים	5 (1st & 2d) הילדים	V. היל*דים
" והקשרים	והקשורים	6 וילדינה	V. ויל*דינה
43 וחמרים	III. וחמ*רים	7 וילדיה	V. ויל*דיה
31 3 אבתיך	III. אב*תיך	10 ותרצני	(VI.?) ותרצני
" ואל מולדתך	VII.	13 הילדים	V. היל*דים
6 ואתיך	V. ואת*יך	" עאלת	אעלת
" ידעתין	V. ידעת*יך	14 אתנחלה	אתנחלה
" כחי	III. כ*חי	" הילדים	V. היל*דים
" אביכן	V. אביכ*יך	17 סבותה	VIII.
8 (1st & 2d) נקרים	נקורים	34 1 לראות	להראות
" " " עקרים	עקורים	4 הילדה	V. היל*דה
9 אביכן	V. אביכ*יך	5 וחריש	והחריש

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
34 13 אחתם	(IV. ?) אחותם	37 35 שאלה	III. שא* לה
14 אחתנו	אחותנו	38 1 אחיו	X.
21 בנתינו	(III. ?) בנתינו	6 בכרו	בכורו
28 וקנינם	וקניאנם	8 והקים	VI. והק(י)ם
25 השלשי	השלשי	12 על	IX.
27 אחתם	III. אח* תם	“ וחירא	וחירה
28 ואת (1st)	את	13 לגו	לגו
“ חמריהם	חמוריהם	14	X.
30 להבישני	להבאישני	“ כפתח	כפתע
“ והכני	והכוני	23 נהי	נהיה
31 אחתנו	אחותנו	“ לבז	III. לב* ז
35 2 והחלפו	והחליפו	24 לזנים	IX.
3 ונקום	ונקומה	39 1 שם	שמה
4 אתם	IX.	5 הפקר	VI. הפק(י)ר
9 וירא	VII.	6 אשר ביד	אשר לו ביד
17 ליד	V. ל*ך	15 חחוצה (?)	החוצה
21 מהאלה	מהלאה	18 כהרמו	כהרמי
24	IX.	19 אפו	X
36 6 יעקוב	יעקב	20 (1st & 2d) הסהר	הסחר
13 נהת	נחת	21 “	“
17 אלה (1st)	ואלה	22 (1st & 2d) “	“
“ נהת	נחת	23 “	“
“ זרע	זרח	40 3 “	“
“ שמה	שמח	5 כפתרנו	כפתרון
22 והימם	ואימם	“ הסהר	הסחר
“ לטן	לוטן	9 סר	שר
23 ושפו	שפו	10 שרגים	שרוגים
24 החמרים	III. החמ* רים	“ הבשלו	VI. הבש(י)לו
26 דישן	דישון	11 אל	על
28 חוין	עוין	12 השרגים	III. השר*גים
39 חדר	הדר	41 2 ובריות	ובריות
“ מחיטבאל	מחיטבל	“ ותריענה	ותרענה
43 מגריאל	מגריאל	3 אחריהן	אחרינה
37 7 קמה	VII.	4 והבריות	והבריות
8 משל	IX.	6 ושדיפות	III. ושדיפ*ת
17 דתניה	III. ד* תינה	“ אחריהן	אחרינה
20 ונשליכהו	ונשלכחו	10 אתם	אתי
23 ויפשוטו	ויפשיטו	11 כפתרנו	כפתרון
24 ריק	VI. ר(י)ק	18 בריאות	בריות
30 אנה	הנה	“ ויפות	III. ויפ*ת

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
41 18 ותריענה	ותרענה	43 24 רגליהם	X.
19 כהן	VII.	" לחמ*ריהם	III.
20 הראי' שונות	VIII.	25 בצהרים	X.
" והבריות	והבריות	30 חדרה	החדרה
21 ותבאהן	ותבאנה	44 3 וחמ*ריהם	III.
23 אחריהן	אחרינה	4 הרחקו	הרחיקו
25 יוסף	יוסף	10 נקואים	VIII.
27 אחריהן	אחרינה	13 חמרו	III. חמ*רו
" ושריפות	III. ושריפ*ת	" וישובו	וישבו
30 אחריהן	אחרינה	14 ביתה	VII.
32 שנית	VII.	20 ויוליד	ויולד
33 וחכם	וחכום	25 שברו	ושברו
34 פקדים	V. פק*דים	27 אליני	אלינו
35 ישמרו	וישמרו	28 אחד	האחד
39 וחכם	III. וחכ*ם	29 שאלה	III. שא*לה
44 יוסב	יוסף	31 ביאגון	ביגון
50 פוטי פרע (VIII.?) פוטי פרע	פוטי פרע	45 1 והוציא	VIII.
" כהנאן	כהן אן	13 כבדי	כבורי
51 נשני	נשאני	21 פי פרעה	IX.
52 הפרני	הפראני	22 (1st & 2d) חליפת	חליפות
54 הרער	הרעב	23 חמרים	III. חמ*רים
56 וישביר	וישבר	46 2 במראת	III. במרא*ת
42 2 אני	הנה	7 בנתו	בנתיו
6 העם	עם	" ובנת	ובנות
17 ויאסף	VIII.	8 בכור	IX.
21 הצרה	VIII.	10 ואהר	VII.
25 סקו	שקו	12 שלה	VII.
26 המריהם	III. חמ*ריהם	" ופרץ	פרץ
27 האחד	VII.	17 אחתם	אחותם
" לחמרו	III. לחמ*רו	20 פוטי פרע (VIII.?)	פוטי פרע
38 שאלה	III. שא*לה	" כהנאן (VIII.?)	כהן אן
43 2 שברו	ושברו	21 ובכר	VIII.
7 היודע	הידוע	" מפים	III. מ*פים
8 טפינו	טפנו	" ואפים	וחפים
12 (2d) בידכם	בידיכם	29 ויראה	וירא
" משנא	משנה	47 4 מרעי	מרעה
16 בנימים	X.	7 ויביא	ויבא
" הבא	הביא	9 ימי חי	IX. ימי שני חי
" בצהרים	IX.	" אבתי	אבותי
18 חמרינו	III. חמ*רינו	14 ביתה	VII.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
47 15 כנעך	כנען	49 15 למס	III. למ*ס
17 בסוסים	IX.	17 עלי (1st)	VII.
“ ובחמרים	III. ובחמ*רים	19 הוא	והוא
“ וינהלם	וינהלם	21 שלוחה	III. של*חה
19 ונהי	ונהיה	“ שופר	(III.?) שפר
“ והאמרה	והארמה	29 אבתי	אבותי
23 אדמתכם	אדמתיכם	50 5 (1st & 2d) השבעני	השביעני
26 לחמש	לחמוש	6 השבעך	השביעך
30 אבתי	אבותי	10 מספר	IX.
48 4 והרביתך	והרביתך	11 ארץ	VII.
15 אבתי	אבותי	“ הכנען	הכנעני
“ מערני	מערוני	“ (2d) למצרים	מצרים
16 אבתי	אבותי	13 אברהם	IX.
“ וידגו לרב	IX.	14 וישוב	וישב
49 3 כחי	III. כ*חי	17 לעדים	IX.
6 תבא	תבוא	18 ואתם	לעבדים
8 ישתחוו	VIII.	20 וישבע	אתם
9 גר	גור	25 בארון	וישביע
10 ומחוקק	ומחוקק	26 בארון	III. באר*ן

EXODUS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
1 11 בסבלתם	בסבלותם	2 18 מהרתן	V. מהרת*ן
13 ויעבדו	ויעברו	20 עזבתן	עזובתן
16 וראיתן	V. וראית*ן	3 5 נעלך	V. נעל*ך
17 הילדים	V. היל*דים	“ רגלך	V. רגל*ך
18 עשיתן	V. עשית*ן	6 אבתך	III. אב*תך
19 המילדת	המילדות	8 ואררה	VIII. & IX.
2 3 בחמר	בחומר	“ והיבוס	VIII.
“ ותשם	VI. ותש(ו)ם	9 ישראל	VIII.
4 אחתו	III. אח*תו	11 פרעה	VIII. & IX.
5 ההלכת	הלכת	“ אוצא	אוציא
6 מילדי	מילידי	13 אנכה	אנכי
7 אחתו	III. אח*תו	15 לדור	IX.
“ לך (2d)	V. ל*ך	“ ודר	ודור
9 להבת	לה בת	17 הפרזי	והפרזי
“ הלך	הלכי	“ החוי	והחוי
“ ואינקהו	והינקהו	21 ונתתי	IX.
11 בסבלתם	בסבלותם	4 5 אבתם	אבותם
17 ויושען	ויושיען	7 השב	השיב

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
4 7	שבע שבה	9 30	ידעתי VII.
12	אם עם	10 1	שמתי ישתי
21	המפתים המופתים	"	אתתי אותתי
"	אחזק אחזיק	2	למען ולמען
22	בכרי בכורי	"	יכל IX.
28	שלחו VIII.	" (1st & 2d)	אבתיך III. אנב* תיך
"	האותות האותות	6 (1st)	" " "
30	"	8	וישיב וישב
5 3	בדרר בדבר	"	אליהה אליהם
10	ושטריו ושוטריו	9	ובזקנינו ובזקיננו
14	שטרי שוטרי	11 3	הרחם הרחמים
15	"	"	תסף III. ת* סף
17	ונזבחה נזבחה	"	בכרי בכורי
18	ועברו עברו	"	בכ* רך III. בכ* רך
19	שטרי ש* טרי III.	4	כחצות כחצית
6 7	סבלת סבלות	5	הרחם הרחמים
14	אבתם אבותם	6	תסף תוסיף
15	ואהר VII.	10	המפתים המופתים
20	אחתם אחותם	12 7	המשקף המשקוף
25	לקח VIII.	16	ביום וביום
7 3	אתתי אותתי	20	וכל כל
11	בלהטיהם בלחטיהם	22	המשקף III. המשק*ף
12	נישלו וישלכו	"	המזות המזוזות
22	בלהטיהם VII.	23	המשקף המשקוף
8 4	בבתי ובבתי	38	ערב רב ערב רב
"	במשארתיד ובמשארתיד	42	לדורותם לדורותם
9	להכרת להכרית	44	כל וכל
18	בלהטיהם בלחטיהם	"	אז IX.
26	נזבח נזבחה	48	הקרב יקרב
"	נזבחה נזבח	13 7	גבולך X.
29	אצא יצא	11	הארץ ארץ
9 2	מחזק V. מחז*ק	19	עצמת IX.
5	" מחזיק	"	עצמתי עצמותי
8	חפניכם III. ח*פניכם	14 2	וישובו וישובו
9	על (3d) ועל	10	הקרב הקריב
16	כחי III. כ*חי	12	ממותינו ממותנו
19	" " "	16	מחזק מחזיק
"	הארץ X.	20	החשך IX.
"	ממטיר VI. ממט(י)ר	21	ויולך ויולך
20	אל IX.	24	ויהם ויהם

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
14 25 וינחגהו	וינחגהו	18 2 של* חיה	III.
" בכבודות	בכבודות	אני	הנה
28 וישובו	IX.	14 נצב	נציב
30 ויושע	ויושיע	16 כי	VIII.
" שפת הים	IX.	20 הורעת	והורעת
15 2 וזמרתיה	IX.	23 עמר	IX.
3 גבור	גיבור	25 ושמרים	III. ויש* טרים
5 תהומות	תהומ* ת. III.	" ושפטתם	IX.
" במזלות	במצלות	19 2 מרפרים	V. מרפ* רים
6 בכח	III. בכ* ח	5 סגלה	סגולה
8 אפיך	IX.	9 לעולם	III. לע* לס
" נזלים	נאזלים	19 10 שמלותם	שמלתם
" קפו	קפאו	11 נכנים	נכונים
" תהומות	תהומ* ת. III.	15 "	"
9 תמלאימו	תמלאמו	20 2 הוצאתיך	VI. הוצאת(י)ך
11 באלים	באילים	5 ועל (1st)	VII.
" נדרי	נדארי	" רבעים	רביעים
" נוראה	נורא	7 כי	IX.
16 חימה	אימה	12 יאריכון	יארכון
18 ועוד	IX.	17 ולא (1st)	לא
19 ברכבו	IX.	" וחמרו	III. וחמ* רו
22 ויוציאהו	ויוציאהו	" בהר גריזים	As one word.
25 ויראהו	ויראהו	" יהוה (2d)	IX.
16 4 ממטיר	V. ממש* ר	19 את (2d)	VII.
14 ככפר	ככופר	" תאכלנו	IX.
18 העריך	הערף	21 היטיבו	הטיבו
24 הבקר	IX.	" ייטיב	ייטב
" הבאיש	הבאיש	" לעולם	לעולם
28 ותורתי	ותורותי	21 5 את (2d)	ואת
29 אל	ואל	10 וענותה	וענתה
33 צנצנת	IX.	15 מכה	VII.
34 וינחהו	ויניחהו	27 יפל	יפיל
36 עשרית	עשירת	30 כפר	III. כ* פר
17 1 ברפרים	ברפ(י)רים VI.	35 או כל	וכל
2 ויאמרו	VIII. & IX.	" או (2d)	IX.
3 "	VII.	" והחצו	וחצו
8 ברפרים	ברפידים	" יחיצון	יחצון
9 אל יהושע	VII.	22 1 וארבעה	וארבע
" נצב	V. נצ* ב	5 שדה (2d)	השרה
16 ודר	VIII.	" מייטב	מיטב

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
22 5 ומיטב	ומיטב	25 30 הנתתה	ונתתה
6 ומצא	VII.	32 (1st & 2d) קנה	קני
" שרה	השרה	33 גביעים	גבעים
" הבערה	V. הבע*רה	" (2d) אחד	IX.
10 נשבה	נשבא	35 והנים	הקנים
14 ומת	או מת	37 חבר	עבר
17 הבתולות	VII.	26 4 הקצונה	הקיצונה
23 ושמע	VII.	10 "	"
24 וחר	וחרה	12 ביריעת	ביריעות
" יתמים	יתומים	13 יריעת	III. יריע*ת
25 כנשיא	כנשא	14 עורת	עורות
30 עמו	אמו	19 (1st & 2d) ירתיו	יתרתיו
31 תשליך	תשליכו	33 שם	שמה
23 4 איבך	IX.	6 ^{2d} שמה	VII.
" חמרו	III. חמ*רו	8 ^{2d} לדרתיכם	III. לר*תיכם
" השב	השיב	10 ^{2d} הכפרים	III. הכפ*רים
11 לכרמך	V. לכרמ*ך	27 5 (1st) המזבח	IX.
" ולזיתך	ולזיתך	11 וחשקיהם כסף	X.
19 ביתה	IX.	12 אמה	IX.
22 בקולם	בקולי	19 יתרתו	יתרתיו
24 מצבתיהם	VIII.	28 11 חתם	חותם
27 (1st) את	ואת	" מוסבת	מוסבות
" עליך	אליך	18 נפך	נפיך
28 ואא	ואת	19 ואהלמה	ואהלמה
31 ושאתי	ושתי	20 מוסבת	מוסבות
" את (1st)	IX.	21 חתם	חותם
" עד	VIII.	26 שתה	שתי
33 יחטיאו	יחטאו	" חבר	עבר
24 5 זבחי	זבחים	30 (1st & 2d) הארים	III. הא*רים
6 וחצי	VIII.	" את משפט	IX.
10 ויראו	IX.	36 חתם	חותם
11 אצלי	אצילי	43 חקת	IV. חק(ו)ת
12 לוחת	III. לוח*ת	29 3 אל	על
" להורותם	להורותם	21 השמחה	המשחה
25 5(1st & 2d) ועורת	ועורות	32 יאכל	יאכלו
12 האחת	האחד	34 הבקר	בקר
14 בטבעות	IX.	36 הכפרים	III. הכפ*רים
16 אל	IX.	40 רבעית	רביעית
21 ואל	VII.	42 שם (1st)	שמה
29 סיכו	יסכו	43 ונקדשו	VIII.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
30 12 כפר	III. כ*פר	34 7 ועל (2d)	על
13 קדש	הקדש	9 לעונינו	לעוננו
15 והרל	IX.	11 אשר	IX.
16 הכפרים	III. הכפ*רים	13 ואשריהם	V. ואש*ריהם
21 לדורתם	לדרותם	16 הזנו	והזנו
23 מדרור	מר דרור	" בנך	בניך
34 והלבניה	וחלבניה	24 אורש	אוריש
" בדר	בבר	26 ביתה	בית
36 שם	שמה	28 ואבעים	וארבעים
31 2 חורי	אורי	29 סני	סיני
7 את (2d)	ואת	" לוחת	III. לוח*ת
10 השרת	השרד	31 וישובה	וישובו
12-14	IX.	35 7 ועורת	III. ועור*ת
16 ושמו	IX.	11 המישכן	IX.
17 לעלם	לעולם	23 ועורת	III. ועור*ת
18 לוחת (1st)	III. לוח*ת	30 חורי	אורי
" את (2d)	לוחות	36 2 אהליאב	VIII.
" כתבים	כתובים	4 ויבאו	ויביאו
32 6 ויגשו	ויגשו	6 ויעבירו	ויעברו
11 בכח	III. בכ*ח	8 בעשי	VII.
13 זכר	זכור	17 הקצונה	VIII.
15 לוחת (1st)	III. לוח*ת	19 עורת	עורות
" את (2d)	לוחות	" עורות	III. עור*ת
" כתבים (1st & 2d)	כתובים	24 ידתיו (1st & 2d)	יתדתיו
16 יהלוחות	והלוחות	29 היו	IX.
" הלוחות	הלוחת	37 1, 2	IX.
33 5 וכליתך	וכליתך	3 האחת	האחר
6 חורב	חורב	" השני	השנית
7 הרחק	V. הרח*ק	17 המנרה	המנורה
8 והבטו	והביטו	18 קנה (1st & 2d)	קני
10 עמוד (2d)	עמר	19 גביעים (1st & 2d)	גבעים
11 ומשרתו	IX.	20 "	"
13 הודעני	הודיעני	38 8 כני	כנו
16 אפו	אפוא	" במראות	III. במרא*ת
" ונפלנו	ונפלאנו	" הצבאת	הצבאות
18 הראני	הריאני	10 עמודיהם	ועמודיו
19 וחנתי	והחנתי	12 אמה	IX.
34 1 לוחת	לוחות	16 ואדנים	והאדנים
4 (1st) "	"	19 ועמודיהם	עמודיהם
" את (2d)	III. לוח*ת	20 ולהחצר	ולחצר

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
38 22 חורי	אורי	39 23 תחרה	VII. עמודיו
27 (1st) הככר	ככר	33 עמדי	עורות
39 3 פחי	פיחי	34 עורת	IX. נ*רתיה (V. ?)
" פתלים	פתלים	36 כליו	נר*ת III.
6 מוסבת	מוסבות	37 נרתיה	לדרותם
11 נפך	נפ(י)ך VI.	" נרות	IX. אל
12 ואהלמה	ואחלמה	40 15 לדרתם	VII. עליו
13 מוסבת	מוסבות	19 את (3d)	לא
18 ויתנם	ויתנום	20 אל	
20 "	"	23 אליו	
21 הארים	הא*רים III.	37 ולא	

LEVITICUS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
1 2 מן (3d)	ומן	6 20 עשרית	עשירת
6 והפשטו	והפשיטו	22 המשח	המשיח
9 וכל	הכל	" עשה, תקטיר	X.
10 ומן	או מן	23 לא	X.
12 יערך	יעריך	27 יכבם	IX.
2 13 (1st) מנחתך	V. מנחת*ך	7 5 המזבחה	X.
" (2d) "	VI. מנחת(י)ך	6 קדש	X.
3 3 הקרב	IX.	12 לתורה	See also IX. התורה
4 3 המשח	המשיח	21 או נפש	ונפש
5 "	"	23 וכשב	כשב
16 "	"	27 כל (1st)	וכל
18 מזבח (1st)	IX.	30 אתה	אתו
21 כאשר	IX.	35 הקריב	הקריבו
22 תעשיהן	תעשינה	36 לדרתם	לדרותם
5 2 או נפש	ונפש	37 ולחטאת	ולחטאת
" ואשם	IX.	8 7 וילבש	וילביש
6 תת	את	8 הארים	הא*רים III.
11 עשרית	עשירת	14 ויגש	ויגיש
12 המזבח	המזבחה	16 ויקטר	ויקטיר
17 תעשיהן	תעשינה	" המזבחה	IX.
6 1 ודבר	וידבר	18 ויגש	ויגיש
4 הפקר	הפק(י)ך VI.	28 ויקטר	ויקטיר
9 הבקר	בקר	9 5 לפני (1st)	אל פני
12 בבקר	בבקר	7 מזבח	המזבח
17 מאשי	VII.	9 ויקרבו	ויקרבו
20 המשח	המשיח	" המזבח	המזבח

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
9 17 ויקטר	ויקטר	13 25 הפך	VII.
20 ויקטר	ויקטר	32 העור	IX.
10 1 ויקרבו	ויקרבו	35 פשה יפשה	IX.
4 דד	III. ד*ר	52 השתה	השתי
" שאו	VII.	56 הכבסו	VIII.
5 בכיתנותם	בכיתנתם	59 עור	העור
6 תמתו	תמותו	14 1 וידבר	וידבר יהוה
7 "	VII.	4 צפרים	צפורים
9 "	תמותו	5 אל (2d)	על
" לדרתיכם	לדורתיםכם	6 החיים	VIII.
10 להבריל	ולהבריל	13 קרש	IX.
15 אשי	אשה	25 ולקח	IX.
16 שרף	שרוף	43 ואחר	IX.
19 אתה	אתי	49 צפרים	צפורים
11 4 וממפרים See also IX.	וממפרים	52 ושני	ובשני
5 השפן כי מעלה	IX.	54 וצרעת	הצרעת
10 ובנחלים	ובנחלים	15 5 במים	IX.
16 התחמום	התחמום	10 והנשא	III. והנ*שא
" השאף	השחף	15 אחד	האחר
19 הרגיפת	III. הר*גיפת	" ואחר	והאחר
21 העף	III. הע*ף	16 ואיש	IX.
" כרעים	III. כ*רעים	" ממנה	ממנו
23 העוף	III. הע*ף	18 אישה	VIII.
" אברע	ארבע	19 זובה (1st)	IX.
25 הנשא	III. הנ*שא	21 כל	וכל
28 והנשא	והנושא	24 אישה	VIII.
29 והחצב	והצב	" ותהיה	VIII.
30 והחמט	III. והחמ*ט	" כל	וכל
38 יתן	יתן	27 "	"
40 והנשא	III. והנ*שא	" בהם	בם
46 נפש	הנפש	31 בטמאת	בטמאתם
47 בין (2d)	ובין	16 3 הקדש	IX.
12 5 שבעים	VIII.	12 מלא	מלוא
13 6 פשע	פשה	" ומלא	ומלוא
7 הראותו	הראתו	" חופניו	III. ח*פניו
21 בשעת	שבעת	15 את (3d)	את את ¹
22 אם	VII.	" אל (2d)	על
23 השחצן	השחין	18 המורח	המזבח

¹ את is written at the end of one line and repeated at the beginning of the next. Cf. Table IX. for other instances of a similar repetition.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
16 21 ירו	ידיו	19 31 האובות	VIII.
" עונת	עונות	" הירענים	III. הירע*נים
22 עונתם	עונותם	35 במישקל	III. במשק*ל
24 (2d) את	The word omitted.	36 מאזני	VII.
27 יוציא	יוצא	37 חקתי	חקותי
" ושרפו	ושרף	20 4 יעלימו	יעלמו
" ערתם	עורתם	5 להזנות	לינות
31 היא	הוא	6 הירענים	III. הירע*נים
17 4 עמו	עמו	" להזנות	לינות
5 זבחי	זבחים	8 חקתי	חקותי
7 לדרתם	לדרותם	16 לרבעה	לרבע
10 אתו	IX.	17 (1st & 2d) אחתו	III. אח*תו
" עמו	IX.	20 דרתו	III. ד*רתו
13 בתוככם	VIII.	22 חקתי	חקותי
14 כינפש	כי נפש	26 ואבריל	VI. ואבר(י)ל
15 וכל	VII.	27 או אשה	ואשה
18 3 ובחקותיהם	III. ובחק*תיהם	" וירעני	או ירעוני
4 חקתי	חקותי	21 3 ולאחתו	III. ולאח*תו
5 "	"	5 לא (1st)	ולא
9 אחתך	אחותך	6 אישי	VII.
10 ערותן	V. ערות*ן	" מקרבים	מקריבים
11 אחתך	אחותך	8 קרשתו	וקרשתו
14 דרתך	III. ד*רתך	9 להזנות	IX.
18 אחתה	אחותה	17 לדרתם	לדורותם
23 בה לטמאה	בה לטמאה	22 2 ואל	IX.
26 חקתי	חקותי	19 ובעזים	או בעזים
30 בהן	IX.	21 ובצאן	או בצאן
19 10 תעולל	III. תע*לל	24 מעוך	ומעוך
13 (2d) ולא	לא	25 משחיתים	משחיתים
15 (1st) "	"	29 לרצונכם	לרצונכם
16 (2d) לא	See also IX. ולא	30 ולא	לא
17 הוכח	הוכיח	23 13 ונסכו	ונסכיו
" תוכח	תוכיח	14 הבאכם	הביאכם
" אל	ולא	" לדרתיכם	III. לד*רתיכם
19 חקתי	חקותי	15 הבאכם	הביאכם
20 חפשי	IX.	17 בכרים	בכורים
" יומת	ימות	19 שני	שנה
25 החמישית	החמישית	20 הבכרים	הבכורים
26 לא	IX.	27 כפרים	כפורים
28 קקע	קקעקע	28 "	"

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
23 30 ואברתי	IX.	26 5 ובציר	V. ר. ו
36 יהוה	יהיה	12 והתהלכתי	והתהלכתי
37 כיווי	ביומו	13 ואולך	ואולך
39 וביום	IX.	15 אם	IX.
42 ישבו	ישב	16 השפחת	השפחת
43 דרתיכם	VIII.	" ומדיבות	ומידבת
24 2 נר	נר (V.?)	19 עזיכם	עזכם
3 יערך	יעריך	20 כחכם	כ* חכם III.
" אתה	אתו	21 כהרי	קרי
" לדרתיכם	לד* רתיכם III.	" תבוא	VIII. & IX.
4 יערך	יער*ך V.	26 והשיבו	IX.
" יהוה	לפני יהוה	" ולא	IX.
9 קדישים	קדשים	27 בקרי	קרי
12 וינחהו	ויניחהו	30 גלליכם	גל* ליכם III.
22 לך	לכם	31 ניהחכם	ניהחכם
25 5 ספחי	ספחי	38 איבכם	איבכם
" קצירך	קציר*ך V.	39 אבותם	אבותם
" נזירך	IX.	40 "	"
9 הכפרים	הכפורים	41 אלך	הלך
10 יושביה	VIII.	43 באשמה	VIII.
11 ספחיה	ספחיה	" חקתי	חקותי
13 ובשנת	בשנת	44 מאסתים	מאסת(ים) VI.
18 חקתי	חקותי	" געלתים	געלת(ים) VI.
20 תבואתינו	תבואתנו	27 8 יעריכנו	יערכנו
23 גרים	IX.	9 ממנו	VII.
24 לארץ	IX.	10 המר	המיר
38 להיות לכם	IX.	18 ונגרעה	ונגרע
41 ישוב	יש*ב III.	29 יומת	ימות
48 (1st) דרו	ד*רו III.	31 וחמישתו	חמישתו
54 לא	IX.	33 המר	המ*ר V.
26 5 בצר	בצ*ר V.		

NUMBERS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
1 2 אבותם	אבותם	1 18 אבותם	אבותם
6 צורישדי	VII.	20 "	"
10 גמלא	גמליאל	22 "	"
11 גרעני	גרעוני	" פקוריהם	פקריהם
12 עמישדי	VII.	23 פדריהם	"
13 פגעאל	פגעאל	24 אבותם	אבותם
16 אבותם	אבותם	26 "	"

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
1 28	אבותם	4 15	כל כלי
30	"	22	אבותם III. אב*תם
32	"	25	ומכסהו מכסהו
"	IX.	"	ומכסה מכסה
34	אבותם	26	ומשכן המשכן
36	"	29	אבותם אבותם
38	VIII.	34	"
"	אבותם	38	"
"	מכן	40	"
40	אבותם	42	"
42	"	46	"
44	"	48	שמנת אלפים IX.
47	"	49	על (1st) IX.
51	ובחנות	"	צוה צוה
2 2	באותות	5 3	את מחניהם את מחניהם
"	אבותם	8	הכפורים הכפורים
12	VII.	13	ונעלם ונעלמה
20	גמלאל	15	עשירת עשירת
22	גדעוני	19	איש*ך V.
27	פגעאל	"	הנקי VII.
32	אבותם	20 (1st & 2d)	איש*ך V.
3 3	IX.	21	והשביע והשבע
"	לכהן	"	בשבועת III. בשב*עת
4	בהקרבים	"	את*ך V.
5	וידבר	"	ולשבועה III. ולשב*עה
6	לפני	"	עמ(י)ך VI.
15	אבותם	"	ירכ*ך V.
20	"	"	בטנ*ך V.
30	למשפח*ת III.	"	צבא VII.
33	IX.	22	האשה IX.
35	למשפח*ת III.	23	המרים המארים
43	ויהיו	24	"
46	פרוי	"	למרים למארים
47	לגלגל*ת III.	26	והרים VII. & IX.
48	העפרים	27	למרים למארים
4 2	אבותם	28	ונקתה VII.
6	בגר	"	ונורעה ונורעה
11	IX.	29	ואשר אשר
12	השרר	6 3	שכר IX.
14	IX.	5	קרוש III. קד*ש

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
6 7 ולאחותו	IV. ולאח(ו)תו	10 23 גמלאל	גמליאל
11 וכהן	הכהן	" פדהצור	פדיצור
17 נסכו	נסכיו	24 גרעני	גרעוני
7 2 אבתם	אבותם	26 פגעאל	V. פגע*אל
8 ארבעת	ארבע	28 בני	IX.
10 המשח	המשיח	29 והיטיבנו	והיטבנו
11 יקריבו	VII.	32 ייטיב	ייטב
29 נב	בן	" והיטיבנו	והיטבנו
41 צורישדי	VII.	33 לתר	לתור
54 גמלאל	גמליאל	35 ויפצו	ויפוצו
60 התשעי	התשיעי	" וינסו	וינסו
" גרעני	גרעוני	11 4 יאכילנו	יאכלנו
61 (1st) אחד	אחת	5 הקשויס	הקשואים
" שניהן	שניהם	" השומים	הישואמים
65 גרעני	גרעוני	10 למשפחותיו	III. למשפח*תיו
71 עמישרי	VII.	" ובעיני	IX.
72 פגעאל	פגעיאל	12 תאמק	תאמר
77 "	"	" האמן	הא*מן (III.?)
84 המשח	V. המשח	15 ואל	IX.
88 "	VI. המשיח	16 ושטריו	ושוטריו
8 4 פרחיה	פריחיה	18 יאכילנו	יאכלנו
" כמראה	IX.	23 היקראך	VII.
7 הזי	VII.	24 זקני	מזקני
9 והקרבת	IX.	26 בכתבים	בכתובים
19, 20	IX.	29 עם	IX.
26 תעשה	תעשו	31 שלוי	IX.
9 3 זככל	זככל	32 שחוטה	VIII.
10 לדרתיכם	III. לדר*תיכם	12 5 הענן	VII.
11 ומדרים	III. ומר*רים	8 בחירת	בחירות
12 ישאירו	ישארו	14 הלא	VIII.
" חקת	IV. חק(ו)ת	13 1 אשר (3d)	IX.
13 ואיש	והאיש	3 ויתרו	ויתורו
14 כחקת	IX.	" אבתיו	III. אב*תיו
19 משמבת	משמרת	6 חורי	אורי
22 (1st) ימים	יומים	11 סודא	סודי
23 יחנה	יחנו	17 לתר	III. לת*ר
10 7 בהקהל	ובהקהל	18 "	לתור
8 לדרתיכם	III. לדר*תיכם	19 הרפא	VII.
10 שכניו	שכניו	20 הוא	IX.
19 צורישדי	צורישרה	" המחבנים	המבחנים

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
13 21 בכרות	III. בכור* ת	14 40 ועלינו	ועלינו
22 ויתרו	ויתורו	43 יהיה	VIII.
" חמתה	VII.	45 וישבו	III. ויש* בו
23 ילידי	VI. יל(י)די	15 4 ברבעית	ברביעית
25 האשכל	האשכול	5 רבעית	רביעית
" אשר	IX.	9 עשרנים	III. עשר* נים
26 וישבו	וישבו	11 בכשבים	IX.
" מתר	מתור	14 לדרתיכם	III. לדר* רתיכם
30 וחכנעני	והכנעני	16 ולגב	ולגר
32 עלות	VII.	20 ערסתיכם	ערסתיכם
33 לתר	לתור	23 לדרתיכם	III. לדר* רתיכם
" אנשים	אנשי	24 לשגנה	בשגנה
34 ונהי	ונהיה	27 והקרבה	והקרבה
" כהגבים	כהגבים	29 יסראל	ישראל
" ובדבר	והבדבר	33 ויקרבו	ויקרבו
" לתר	לתור	36 ויוציאו	ויוציאו
14 2 ויאמרו	VIII.	38 לדרתם	III. לדר* רתם
3 יהיו	IX.	" ציצית	See also IX. ציצית
" לבו	לבוז	39 לציצות	לציציות
" שוב	VII.	" תתרו	תתורו
6 האתרים	III. האת* רים	16 5 וידבר	IX.
7 לתר	לתור	9 לעמד	IX.
" אתה טובה	IX.	13 תשתרר	תשתורר
8 הארץ	ארץ	" עלינה	עלינו
11 אנה	הנה	" תשתרר	תשתורר
13 בכחך	III. בכ* חך	14 הביאתנו	הבאתנו
14 שמעו	VIII.	" אנשים	האנשים
15 אחד	האחד	22 אחד	האחד
17 כח	III. כ* ח	26 סרו	סורו
18 רבעים	רביעים	29 ימותון	ימותון
19 אנה	הנה	30 יברא	See also VII. יברא
22 אתתי	אותתי	" ופשתה	ופצתה
23 לאבתם	לאבותם	" שאלה	III. שא* לה
25 וסעו	סעו	33 "	"
" דרך ים סוף	IX.	35 מקרבי	מקריבו
27 בני ישראל	IX.	38 הקריבים	הקריבום
31 לבו	VIII.	42 ויראה	VII.
36 לתר	לתור	48 המתים	המתים
" וישבו	וישבו	49 (1st & 2d) "	"
38 לתר	לתור	50 וישב	וישב

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
17 3	אבותם	21 27	ותתכונן
4	שם	29	פלו(י)טים VI.
6	אבותם	30	ועד
8	ויצא	32	בנ*תיה III.
"	שקידים	33	לקראתם IX.
18 7	עבדה	22 6	נכה IX.
"	ומתנה	12	עמם VII.
12	תירוש	18	או זהב
24	ובתוך	19	ואדע
19 3	ושטח	21	אתנו III.
9	אפר	22	"
10	ולגר	23	נצב V. ב.
12	הוא	24	במשעל
13	IX.	26	עבר
18	בקבר	"	ויעמר
21	ומזי	30	הלו(א) IV.
20 5	תאנה	31	נציב
"	וגפן	32	אתנך III.
6	וירא	34	נצב(י) VI.
11	ותשתי	"	רעה VII.
13	וכגברתך V.	39	ויביאהו
"	אעברה	"	חיצות
"	תשבירו	23 6	נצב V. ב.
21	נתן	10	מי מנה עפר
24	פי	"	ומספר VIII.
21 1	האתרים III.	"	את The word omitted.
2	נתן	"	מרבעת
"	וחרמתי	11	לקב IX.
6	השרפים III.	17	נציב
11	במדבר	18	קומה
"	בם	"	ושמעה VII.
13 ¹ twice	היוצא... בין Once only.	19	אדם VII.
15	הנחלם	21	בישראל
18	כראוה	22	כתעפות
"	במחוקק	30	ההמזבח
"	ובמשענותם VIII.	21 4	שרי
19	נחליאל	"	יחזי
"	ומנחליאל	6	נטעי
22	נלך	8	כתעפות

¹ Doubtless a printer's double of eight words.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
24 12	הלוא	VIII.	26 57 פק(ו)די IV.
13	עבור	IX.	59 אחותם
16	מחזי	מחזה	63 פק(ו)די IV.
"	שרה	VII.	27 1 למשפחת למשפחות
"	יחזי	יחזה	4 IX.
17	ומחן	IX.	5 ויקרב ויקרב
18 (1st & 2d)	ירושה	ירשה	7 נתן נתן
23	אוי	III. א*י	9 נחלתו See also IX.
24	יענו	VIII.	14 פי פי
"	ויענו	VIII.	17 רעה רעה
25	וילך	IX.	19 לעיניהם לעיניהם
"	וישוב	וישב	28 5 ועשרית ועשרית
25 1	להזנות	לזנות	6 IX.
3	ויצמר	IX.	7 ונסכו ונסכו
7	היקח	ויקח	9 VIII.
14	הישראל	ישראל	11 תמימים תמימים
15	כזבית	VII.	26 הבכ*רים III.
18	כזבי	VII.	" בהקריבכם בהקריבכם
"	אחתם	אחותם	29 2 איל VII.
26 1	אחרי	אחר	20 עשתי עשתי
2	אבתם	אבותם	" IX.
7	משפחות	IV. משפח(ו)ת	39 לעלתיכם III.
10	לנס	לנוס	30 2 צוה IX.
12	למשפחת	III. למשפח*ת	3 היוצא VIII.
"	הימיני	IX.	6 (1st & 2d) הנא הניא
15	למשפחתם	למשפחותם	" ינא יניא
"	השוי	השוני	" ויהוה ויהוה
24	ליושב	ליושב	9 יניא יניא
"	היושבי	היושבי	" V. והפר והפר
25	ושלש	IX.	11 בשבועה III.
30	לחלק	וחלק	12 הנא הניא
34	משפחת	משפחות	13 הפיר הפיר
38	לאשבאל	לאשביל	" הפירם הפירם
"	האשבאלי	האשבלי	15 (1st & 2d) חריש החריש
41	לפקדיהם	ופקדיהם	" והקם והקם
42	אלה (1st)	ואלה	" הקם הקים
47	לפקדיהם	IX.	16 הפר הפ(י)ר VI.
51	פקדי	IV. פק(ו)די	31 2 אל IX.
55	אבתם	אבותם	3 החלצו VI.
"	יתנחלו	IX.	14 פקדי פק*די III.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
31 15 החייתם	החיתם	33 29 ממתיקה	VI. ממת(י)קה
18 חי	החיו	30 במסירות	במסרות
19 ושבתכם	ושביתכם	31 ממסירות	ממסרות
21 את	IX.	40 הכפעני	הכנעני
28 החמרים	III. החמ*רים	52 משביתם	משביותם
30 "	" "	54 ולמעט, על	IX.
34 וחמרים	III. וחמ*רים	55 את	את כל *
38 ובקר	IX.	34 4 חצר	אצר
44 והבקר	IX.	5 תוצאתו	תוצאיתו
47 אחז	האחז	6 לכם	IX.
" אחד	האחד	8 חמתה	VIII.
" אל הלויים	ללויים	" תוצאתו	תוצאיתו
48 הפקדים	III. הפק*דים	9 "	"
54 ויביאו	ויבאו	11 הרבלה	הארבלה
32 3 ושבמה	VIII.	12 תוצאתו	תוצאיתו
5 תעברנו	תעבירנו	14 (1st & 2d) אבתם	אבותם
10	IX.	" לבית אבתם וחצי	IX.
14 אבתיכם	III. אב*תיכם	35 1 אל (2d)	על
17 הביאונם	הביאונם	5 פאת (3d)	IX.
" המבצר	V. המבצ*ר	6 ועליהם	ועליהן
" יושבי	י"שבי	16 וימת	IX.
20 (2d) אם	VII.	17 ימות (2d)	יומת
22 תשובון	VIII.	19 הוא (1st)	IX.
" נקואים	נקוים	20 "	או
27 יעברו	IX.	28 מות (2d)	IX.
28 האבות	אבות	31 כפר	כ*פר III.
33 (1st) ממלכת	ממלכו(ת) (IV.?)	32 "	" "
" (2d) "	ממלכות	36 1 למשפחת	למשפחות
" בגבולת	בגבולות	3 נחלתן	V. נחלת*ן
35 ויגבחהה	VII.	" אבתינו	III. אב*תינו
36 מבצר	מבציר	" תהינה	תהינה
38 בעלמון	בעל מעון	4 אבתינו	III. אב*תינו
" מוסבת	מוסבות	" נחלתן (2d)	V. נחלת*ן
33 3 מרעמסם	IX.	8 יהיה	תהיה
7 מגרל	IX.	9 תסוב	תסב
8 ימים	VIII.	11 רדיהן	III. ר*דיהן
14 ברפרים	ברפידים	12 נחלתן	V. נחלת*ן
15 מרפרים	מרפידים	13 ירן	ירן
28 במתיקה	VI. במת(י)קה		

DEUTERONOMY.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
1 7	שכניו	4 39	והשיבת והשבות
"	בהר	"	על אל
11	אבותיכם	41	יבדיל יבדיל
19	ונבוא III. ונב* א	42	לנום לנום
20	אליכם IX.	43	בוצר בוצר
"	אלהינו IX.	"	רמות רמות
28	וערים ערים	"	למנשי VII.
32	והדבר והדבר	47	ויירשו IX.
33	לתור לתור	49	אשרות אשרות
38	החזק החזק	5 9	תשתחוה תשתחוה
39	לב* ין III.	"	ועל VII.
40	וסעו לכם וסעו לכם	"	רביעים רביעים
44	תעשינה תעשינה	14	והמרך III. וחמ* רך
2 1	ונסב ונסב	15	ויוציאך ויוציאך
5	מדרך כף IX.	16	יארכון יארכון
6	תשבירו תשבירו	21	והמורו III. וחמ* רו
7	המדבר IX.	"	בהר גריזים As one word.
"	נלך IX.	"	היושב IV. והיושב
"	נסור IX.	22	לוחת III. לוח* ת
8	מאילת מאילת	29	לעלם III. לע* לס
10-12	IX.	6 9	מזות מזות
23	היושבים היושבים	22	אותות אותות
26	קדימות קדמות	"	ומ* פתים III. ומ* פתים
30	תת את	7 4	וחר VIII.
36	לא היתה IX.	5	ואשריהם V. ואש* ריהם
3 4	ארגב הארגב	"	ופסליהם ופסליהם
5	הערים ערים	6	סגלה III. סג* לה
6	לסיחון לסיחון	8	מאהבת מאהבת
17	אשרת אשרת	"	השב* עה III. השבועה
23	ואתחננה ואתחננה	9	הוא IX.
24	וכגבורת* ד V. וכגבורתך	13	דגנך VI. דגנ* יך
26	ולא IX.	"	אשר... יהוה IX.
4 6	חכום IV. חכום	19	והמפתים IV. והמו* פתים
13	לוחת III. לוח* ת	25	פסלי פסלי
18	דגה VII.	8 3	אבתך III. אב* תך
34	ובמ* פתים III. ובמפתים	7	יוציאים יוצאים
37	אבתך III. אב* תך	10	אל על
"	ובכחו III. ובכ* חו	11	וחקתיו III. וחק* תיו
38	ועצמים ועצומים	17	כח* חי III. כח

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
8 17 ועצם	III. ועצ*ם	12 5 שמה	שם
18 כח	III. כ*ח	11 שם (2d)	שמה
" ולמען	VII.	13 עלתיך	עלת(י)ך VI.
20 אלהיכם	IX.	14 "	עלת*ך V.
9 1 ועצומים	IV. ועצ(ו)מים	15 יאכלנו	IX.
4 מורשם	מורישם	17 לאכלך	לאכל
5 "	"	" דגניך	דגנ(י)ך VI.
7 זכר	זכור	" תירושיך	תירשך
8 להשמיר	IX.	20 אלהים	אלהיך
9 בעלתי	בעלותי	13 5 אתכם	The word omitted.
" (2d) לוחת	לוחות	6 ואבתיך	ואב*תיך III.
10 כתבים	כתובים	8 לא (2d)	ולא
11 לוחת	III. לוח*ת	9 תהגרנו	תהגרנו
13 קשי	קשה	11 יוסיפו	יוספו
15 לוחת	III. לוח*ת	13 בליעל	בלעיל
17 ואשלכם	ואשליכם	14 2 סגלה	סגולה
19 יהוה (1st)	IX.	5 אקו	ואקו
26 אל	IX.	6 וכל	כל
27 זכר	זכור	7 ממעלה	ממעלי
" קשי	IX.	" וממפרים	וממפרים
29 בכחך	III. בכ*חך	" מעלה	מעלי
10 1 לוחת	III. לוח*ת	15 התחמם	התחמום
3 "	" "	" השאף	השאף
7 נחליה	נחלי	18 הרגיפת	הרגיפת
11 לאבתם	לאבותם	19 וכל	כל
12 ליראת	ליראה	23 רגניך	רגנך
" אה	את	27 לה	לו
15 באבתיך	III. באב*תיך	15 5 לעשות	ולעשות
17 והגבור	והגיבור	6 והעבטת	IX.
22 אבתיך	III. אב*תיך	" תעבט	IX.
11 3 אתותיו	אתותיו	8 והעביט	העביט
8 את (1st)	את כל	9 בליעל	בלעיל
12 הארץ	ארץ	18 חפשי	VII.
14 דגניך	דגנך	19 הבכור	הבכ(ו)ר (IV.?)
20 מזות	מזות	" בכבור	בבכ(ו)ר (IV.?)
22 ולדבקה	ולהדבקה	" בכור	בכ(ו)ר (IV.?)
23 והוריש	והוריש	16 9 בקמה	VII.
29 הר גריזים	As one word.	18 שפטים	ש*פטים III.
30 היושב	הישב	" ושטרים	וש*טרים III.
12 5 לשכינו	לשכנו	17 12 בזידון	בזי(ו)רון VI.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
17 12	ואל	או אל	נפלים IX.
20	ראם	IX.	תקד(י)ש VI.
"	ממלכתו	ממלתו	בתולות
18 1	אשה	אשי	לזנות
3	והלחם	והלחים	השכב See also IX.
4	דגניך	דגנך	ענהה VII.
8	יאכל	IX.	לא (2d) ולא
10	מעביר	מעבר	IX.
11	המתים	המתים	וטובותם
12	מורשם	מורישים	לע *לם III.
14	ירשים	IX.	יולדו
15	אליו	ואליו	מחניך
16	אוסף	אוסף	IX.
22	הדבר	IX.	קדשה
"	בזידון	V. בז *רון	קדש
"	תגורו	תגור	וכי
19 3	ינחילך	ינחלך	תחטאו
5	ביער	ביע *ר (III.?)	צויתם
"	ונשל	IX.	VIII.
7	תברל	תבריל	השיב
17	אנשים	האנשים	V. מגר *ך
"	לפני	ולפני	ימותו
"	והשפטים	III. והש *פטים	תעולל
18	השפטים	III. הש *פטים	להכתו
21	ררגל	רגל	יהיה
20 5	השטרים	III. הש *טרים	יארכון
8	"	"	זכור
9	"	"	הנשלים
10	וקראתה	וקראת	ובמופתים
11	למס	למוס	III. בא *ני
18	תועבתם	תועבותם	V. קדש *ך
19	לבוא... במצור	IX.	III. סג *לה
21 2	ושטריך	ושוטריך	הירדן
3	בעול	בעל	נהיתה
11	ולקחתה	VII.	III. הק *תיו
14	עניתה	VI. ענ(י)תה	III. אחתו (III.?)
17	הבכרה	הבכורה	ההמים
20	וסובה	וסובא	VIII.
23	תלאי	תלואי	ולברך
22 1	השב	השיב	ועשתרות
22 4			נפלים IX.
9			תקדיש VI.
19			בתולות
21			לזנות
29			השכב See also IX.
"			ענהה VII.
30			לא (2d) ולא
23 4			בצאתכם IX.
6			וטובותם
"			לע *לם III.
8			יולדו
14 (1st & 2d)			מחניך
16			בטוב IX.
17			קדשה
"			קדש
22			וכי
24 4			תחטאו
8			צויתם
11			VIII.
13			השיב
14			V. מגר *ך
16 (1st & 2d)			ימותו
21			תעולל
25 3			להכתו
15			יהיה
"			יארכון
17			זכור
18			הנשלים
26 8			ובמופתים
14			III. בא *ני
15			V. קדש *ך
18			III. סג *לה
27 4			הירדן
9			נהיתה
10			III. הק *תיו
22			III. אחתו (III.?)
28 7			ההמים
"			VIII.
12			ולברך
18			ועשתרות

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
28 20	השמירך	28 63	אתכם
"	האבירך	68	בא* ניות III.
22	יכך IX.	29 3	והמופתים
24	השמירך	5	ואולך
25	ובשבעה	8	המנשה
"	ממלכת	9	תשכילו
27	יכך IX.	10	וש* טריכם III.
"	ובחרם	11	מחניך
28	יכך IX.	12	לעברך
31	חמורך	15	אשר (1st) VIII.
"	גזול מלפניך ולא	17	גל* ליהם III.
33	ופרי	19	הרוה
35	יככה VII.	20	לא VII.
36	יולך	21	הכתובה
39	תגאר	23	וצב* אים III.
40	ישל	25	אבותם
"	זיתך VI. זית(י)ך	28	אחרת
41	תולד	29	והנגלאו VII.
42	יורש	30 1	והשיבות
48	איבך VI. איב(י)ך	"	על אל
51	האבירו	10	וחק* תיו III.
53	יציק	16	וללכת
54	יותר	20-34:12	X.
55	שעריך IX.		

The manuscript has none of the headings of books and sections found in Blayney's edition nor are the initial letters of the books of extraordinary size. The punctuation and the division into paragraphs are not identical with those of the printed text but a detailed statement of the difference is beyond the scope of this collation.

TABLE II.

The only place where two readings are actually given is Gen. 30:37. See *HEBRAICA*, Vol. IX., p. 223.

TABLES III., IV., V. AND VI.

It is not deemed necessary to reprint these Tables apart from Table I. There the text which the scribe preferred is given at length and the secondary readings are indicated by asterisks and parentheses, the former denoting the insertion of a ך or a ך', as the case may be, and the latter the omission of the inclosed letters.

TABLE VII.

GENESIS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.			Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.
4 4	ומחלביהן	¹ B. ומחלבינה		25 4	עיפה	B. איפה(?)	
10 15	חת	החת	B.	11	ראי	ראה	B.
12 15	ביתה	B.	בית	28 6	ויצו	ויצוו	B.
16	עבדים	ועבדים	B.	30 14	מדוראי	B. מדורי	
14 1	ואריץ	אריץ	B.	31 3	ואל מולדתך	ולמולדתך	B.
5	בהם	B.	בחס	35 9	וירא	ויראה	B.
"	בשוה ²			37 7	קמה	קאמה	B.
8	היא	הוא	B.	41 19	כהן	B.	כנהג
17	השוה ²			32	שנית	השנית	B.
24	אשכול	B.	ואשכול	42 27	האחר	B.	אחר
16 14	ראי	B.	ראה	44 14	ביתה	B.	בית
19 9	אחר	האחר	³ B.	46 10	ואהר	B.	ואחר
17	ההרה	ההר	B.	12	שלה	B.	ושלה
28 (1st)	הארץ	B.	ארץ	47 14	ביתה	B.	בית
22 5	נלכה	נלך	B.	49 17	עלי (1st)	עלה	B.
24 46	השקתה	B.	אשקתה	50 11	ארץ	הארץ	B.

EXODUS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.			Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.
6 15	ואהר	B.	ואחר	22 6	ומצא	ומצאה	B.
7 22	בלהטיהם	B.	בלחטיהם	17	הבתולות	B. (?) בתולות	
9 30	ידעתי	B.	ידעת	23	ושמע	שמע	B.
17 3	ויאמרו	B.	ויאמר ⁵	25 21	ואל	B.	ועל
9	אל יהושע	ליהושע	B.	26 6 ^{2d}	שמה	B.	שם(?)
20 5	ועל (1st)	על	B.	36 8	בעשי	בעשאי	B.
19	את (2d)	ואת	B.	39 23	תחרה	B.	תחרא
21 15	מכה	ומכה	B.	40 20	אל	B.	על

¹ B = reading of Blayney's edition.² These two entries should have been omitted from Table I.³ The mark perhaps accidental.⁴ The mark perhaps unfinished or accidental.⁵ Cf. Ex. 17:2 in Table IX. A.

LEVITICUS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.			Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.
6 17	מאשי	B.	מאשה	17 15	וכל	B.	כל
10 4	שאו	B.	ושאו	19 36	מאזני	B.	מוזני (?)
7	תמתו		תמותו	21 6	אשי	B.	אשה
13 22	אם		ואם	27 9	ממנו	B.	ממנה
25	הפך		הפכה				

NUMBERS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.			Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.
1 6	צורישדי	B.	צורישדה	16 30	יבבא	B.	יברה
12	עמישדי	B.	עמישרה	42	ויראה	B.	וירא
2 12	צורישדי	B.	צורישדה	19 21	ומזי	(?)B.	ומזה
5 19	הנקי	B.	הנקיא	20 5	תאנה	B.	ותאנה
21	צבא	B.	צבה	6	וירא	B.	ויראה
26	והרים	B.	הרים (?)	11	ותשתי	B.	ותשתה
28	ונקתה	B.	ונקאתה	22 12	עמם	B.	עמהם
7 11	יקריבו	B.	ויקריבו	34	רעה	(?)B.	רע
41	צורישדי	B.	צורישדה	23 18	ושמעה	B.	ושמע
71	עמישדי	B.	עמישרה	19	אדם	B.	האדם
11 23	היקראך	B.	היקרך	24 16	שדה	B.	שרי
12 5	הענן	B.	ענן	25 15	כזבית	B.	כזבי
13 19	הרפא	B.	הרפה	18	כזבי	B.	כזבית
22	חמתה	B.	חמת	29 2	איל	B.	ואיל
32	עלות	B.	לעלות	32 20	אם (2d)	B.	ואם
14 3	שוב	B.	שובה	35	ויגבחה ויגבחה	(?)	ויגביהוה

DEUTERONOMY.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.			Reading Given.	Reading Indicated.
4 18	דגה	B.	דגי	21 11	ולקחתה	B.	ולקחת
43	למנשי	B.	למנשה	22 29	ענהה	B.	ענה
5 9	ועל	B.	על	28 35	יכבה	B.	יכך
8 18	ולמען	B.	למען	29 20	לא	B.	ולא
15 18	חפשי	B.	חפשה	29	והנגלאו	B.	והנגלאות
16 9	בחה	B.	בקאמה				

In Tables VIII. and IX. reference will be found to some other places in which secondary readings were indicated.

TABLE VIII.

The additions are inclosed in parentheses. They are interlineations except where otherwise stated. "1st" denotes the first scribe and "2d" another hand, no attempt being here made to discriminate between the work of perhaps several later scribes. Where the additions are in exactly the same ink as the surrounding text "a" is added; while these changes *may* have been made immediately after the writing of the word affected, it should be borne in mind that the first writer used the same kind of ink throughout the volume, although its transcription occupied considerable time. No account is taken of the text supplied on paper in many places principally by the writer of the Arabic colophon. See also Table IX.

GENESIS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex. Readings.	Author of Change.	Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex. Readings.	Author of Change.
15 7	הוצאתיך	הוצאת(י)ך	1st; a.	42 17	ויאסף	ויאס(ף)	Prob. 1st.
10	בתור	בת(ו)ר	" "	21	הצרה	הצר(ע)ה	1st.
21 16	כמטחוי	כמט(ח)וי	" "	44 10	נקואים	נקו(א)ים	1st; a.
25 23	הצעיר	(ה)צעיר ¹	" "	45 1	והוציא	והוצי(א)ו	" "
27 12	והבאת	והבאת(י)	Prob. 1st.	46 20	פוטפרע		⁴
29 16	הקטנה	הק(ט)נה	1st; a.	"	כהנאן		⁵
33 17	סכותה	סכות(ה) ²	" "	21	ובכר	ובכ(ו)ר ⁶	1st; a.
41 20	הראישונות	הראיש(ו)נות	" "	49 8	ישתחוו	ו(י)שתחוו ⁷	Prob. 1st.
50	פוטפרע	³					

EXODUS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex. Readings.	Author of Change.	Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex. Readings.	Author of Change.
3 8	וארדה	וארד(ה)	?	18 16	כי	ו(י)כי ¹¹	Prob. 1st.
"	והיבוס ⁸	והבוס ⁸		23 24	מצבתיהם	מצבת(י)הם ¹²	" "
9	ישראל	ישראל(י) ⁸	2d.	31	ער	ו(ו)ער ^{14, 13}	" "
11	פרעה	See Table IX. B.		24 6	וחצי	See Table IX. C.	
4 28	שלחו	שלח(הו) ?		29 43	ונקדשו	ונקדש(ו) ^{16, 15}	Prob. 1st.
6 25	לקח	(לקח)	Prob. 1st.	36 2	אהליאב	אהול(י)אב	1st; a.
17 2	ויאמרו	See Table IX. A.		17	הקיצונה	הק(י)צונה	" "
16	ורר	ו(ו)רר ^{10, 9}	Prob. 1st.				

^{1, 2} and ⁶ A mark over the interlineated letter, contemporary with it, indicating its omission for a secondary reading.

^{3, 4,} and ⁵ Perhaps each of these expressions was at first written as one word and the dots which separate them into two, as given in Table I., subsequently inserted by the first scribe. פוטפרע appears as one word in Gen. 41:45 and כהנאן as one in Gen. 41:45, but as two in v. 50.

⁷ The י prefixed, not interlineated. Its insertion was at the first writing indicated for a secondary reading.

⁸ The ך was doubtless placed where it is by mistake. The intention was evidently to change ויבוס, v. 8, to ויבוסך; the ך is above the ך.

^{9, 11, 12, 13, 15} Inserted in line, not interlineated.

¹⁰ and ¹⁶ The insertion of the letter added was at the first writing indicated for a secondary reading.

¹⁴ The writer of the ך indicated its omission for a secondary reading.

LEVITICUS.

Watson Codex.				Watson Codex.			
Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Readings.	Author of Change.	Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Readings.	Author of Change.
12 5	שבעים	שב(ו)עים	1st; a.	17 13	בתוככם	בתוכ(כ)ם	Prob. 2d.
13 56	הכנסו	הכנס(ו)	Prob. 1st.	19 31	האבות	הא(ו)בות	1st; a.
14 6	החיים	(ה)חיים	?	23 43	דרתיכם	ר(ו)ר(ו)תיכם	1st; ?a.
15 18	אישה	אישה ² (ה)	1st; a.	25 10	ישיבה	י(ו)שיבה ⁴	1st; a.
24	אישה	אישה(ה)	Perhaps 1st.	26 21	תבוא	See Table IX. A.	
"	ותהיה	ותהיה ³ (ה)	Same as of last preceding.	43	באשמה	ב(ו)אשמה	1st; a.

NUMBERS.

Watson Codex.				Watson Codex.			
Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Readings.	Author of Change.	Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Readings.	Author of Change.
1 38	תולדתם	תולד(ת)ם	?	24 12	הלוא	הל(ו)א ¹¹	1st ?
11 32	שחוטת ^{6, 5}	שחוט(ה)	Prob. 1st.	24	יענו	יענ(ה) ¹²	1st; a.
12 14	הלא	הל(ו)א	2d ?	"	ויענו	ויענ(ה)	" "
14 2	ויאמרו	ויאמר(ו)	1st; a.	28 9	ונסכו	ונסכ(י)	" "
14	שמעו	שמעו ⁷ (ו)	" "	30 3	היוצא	היוצא	" "
31	לבו	לב(ו)ז	" "	32 3	ושבמה	ושבמ(ה) ¹³	" "
43	יהיה	יהיה ⁸ (ה)	1st ?	22	תשובון	תשובון ¹⁴	?
21 18	ובמשענותם	וב(מ)שענתם	Prob. 2d.	33 8	ימים	ימים ¹⁵	1st.
23 10	ומספר ^{10, 9}	מספר(ו)	Prob. 1st.	34 8	חמתה	חמת(ה)	1st; a.

DEUTERONOMY.

Watson Codex.				Watson Codex.			
Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Readings.	Author of Change.	Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Readings.	Author of Change.
7 4	וחר	וחר(ה)	1st ?	28 7	ובשבע	ובשבע(ה) ¹⁶	1st; a.
24 11	יוצא	יוצא(א)	1st ?	29 15 (1st)	אשר	אשר	" "

¹ The addition of a ך for a secondary reading was probably indicated at the first writing.

² 4, 7 and 12 A mark over the interlineated letter, contemporary with it, indicating its omission for a secondary reading.

³, ⁵, ⁹ and ¹¹ The insertion of the letter added was at the first writing indicated for a secondary reading; probably so also at ¹⁴ and ¹⁵.

⁶, ⁸ and ¹⁵ Inserted in margin.

¹⁰ Inserted in line.

¹² The interlineated ה has been erased.

TABLE IX.

A. Letter erased and no other put in its place.

This section includes the words from which letters have been removed, either by scratching or by washing out, without the substitution of others. The letters erased are inclosed in brackets. "Sec." denotes that the shorter text was indicated as a secondary reading by the original scribe. It is of course difficult to assign a simple erasure to its maker. The manuscript, however, affords proof that the changes in Ex. 17:2, Lev. 21:9 and Num. 11:15 at least were made by the first hand.

GENESIS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
4 25	ידע [י?ידע]	25 8	עמו Sec. עמו[ו]
15 16	ישוב [ישובו]	27 28	ויתן " ויתן[ו]
17 6	ומלכים [ת]כים or מלא	29 7	גדול " [ה]גדול
16	ומלכי [ת]כי or מלא	30 32	אעברה ?Sec. אעבר[ה]
19 20	אמלט Sec. [ה]אמלט	37 8	משל ?Sec. מש[ו]ל
26	ותהי " [ה]ותהי	38 24	לזנים ?Sec. לזנ[ו]נים
21 7	הינקה ?Sec. הינ[ו]קה		

EXODUS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
3 15	לדור [ו]לדור	16 24	הבקר [ב?]הבקר
10 2	יכל Sec. [ו]יכל	17 2	ויאמרו 1
12 44	אז " [ו]אז	18 23	עמד עמ[ו]מד
13 19	עצמות [ו]עצמות	23 4	איבך איב[ו]ך
14 20	החשך [ו]החשך	19	ביתה [ו]בית
28	וישובו [ו]וישובו	25 33	(2d) אחר Sec. [ה]אחר
15 2	חמרת[ה] Sec. [ו]חמרת	27 12	אמה ?Sec. [ה?]אמה
8	אפיך " [ו]אפיך	38 12	אמה [ב]אמה
18	ועוד [ו]ועוד		

LEVITICUS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
4 18	מזבח (1st) Sec. [ה]מזבח	25 5	נזיר[ו]ך נזיר[ו]
15 19	זובה (1st) [ו]זובה	26 15	אם [ו]אם
21 9	להזנות Sec. [ו]להזנות	21	תבוא 2
23 30	ואברתי Sec. [ו]האברתי	26	והשיבו [ו]והשיבו

¹ The facts seem to show that the word was first written without the final ם, that ם was then added and that subsequently the ם was erased but its addition indicated as a secondary reading, all by the first hand. Cf. Ex. 17:3 in Table VII.

² The original reading was תבוא (or תבנו) but an ם has been interlineated by a second (?) hand and the original ם (or ת) erased, making the text read תבנו.

NUMBERS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
9 14	כחק[ות] Sec.	24 13	עבור עב[ו]ר
11 15	ואל ¹	17	ומחין [ח]מחין
29	עם Sec.	25 3	ויצמד [י]יצמד
31	שלוי [ה]עם	28 6	העשויה העשו[י]ה
15 38	ציצת [י]ציצת	31 88	ובקר ו[ה]בקר
16 9	לעמד [ו]לעמד	44	והבקר ?Sec. ו[ה]בקר
20 13	אעברה ?Sec. [ה]אעברה	33 7	מגרל מגר[ו]ל
23 11	להב Sec. [ו]להב		

DEUTERONOMY.

Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney's Edition.	Watson Codex.
15 6	העבט תעבונט	28 22	יכך Sec. [י]כך
17 20	ראם ?Sec. [ו]ראם	27	" " "
18 8	יאכל [ו]יאכל	28	" " "

B. Letter changed into or substituted for another.

Erasure and addition, either singly or combined, were used to transform one letter into another in the places here referred to. "B," "1st" and "2d" have the same signification as in Tables VII. and VIII.

GENESIS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney.	Watson Codex.
	Original Reading. Present Reading.		Original Reading. Present Reading.
14 2	היא הוא 2d B.	45 21	פי פרעה פרעה 2d B.
38 12	על B. אל 2d B.		

EXODUS.

Ch. Vs. Blayney.	Watson Codex.	Ch. Vs. Blayney.	Watson Codex.
	Original Reading. Present Reading.		Original Reading. Present Reading.
3 11	פרעה B. ²	25 16	אל על ³
9 20	אל על 2d B.	30 15	והרל וחרל ⁴

¹ At first ולא but the ל erased and a small ל added by the first hand after the א, making the text read as in Blayney.

² A second hand added a stroke turning the פ into a נ but cancelled his work.

³ Changed by a second hand to אל and then changed back to על by the same person; the first scribe probably indicated אל as a secondary reading.

⁴ Perhaps there was an attempt made to change the original ח into ה.

LEVITICUS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Original Reading.	Present Reading.			Original Reading.	Present Reading.
6 27	יכבס	תכבס	Prob. 1st B.	18 30	בהן	בהם ³	Prob. 1st B.
17 10	אתו	1B. ?	אתה 1st B.	19 20	חפשי	חפשה ⁴ ?	B.
"	עמו	2B. ?	עמה 1st B.	25 24	לארץ	הארץ ⁵	1st B.

NUMBERS.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Original Reading.	Present Reading.			Original Reading.	Present Reading.
14 3	יהיו	יהיה ⁶	? 1st B.	26 47	לפקדיהם	ופקדיהם	B.
21 33	לקראתם	לקראתנו	1st B.	55	יתנחלו	תתנחלו	? 1st B.
22 6	נכה	(?) נכח	B.	27 4	תנו	תנה	? 1st B.
26 25	ושלש	וארבע	? 1st 7B.	9	נחללתו (Double ל)	נחלתו ⁸	1st B.

DEUTERONOMY.

Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.		Ch. Vs.	Blayney.	Watson Codex.	
		Original Reading.	Present Reading.			Original Reading.	Present Reading.
2 7	נלך	אלך	B.	9 27	קשי	קשה ⁹	B. 1st
"	נסור	אסור	B.				

C. Other erasures.

What may be called simple erasures not belonging to either of the foregoing classes are here grouped together. The words printed are those written over them or most closely related to them. Detailed statements in regard to their position—whether beneath or entirely to one side of the words given,—the exact contents of the first writing, etc., would take up too much space. In many places what has been removed was less than a letter but in others it was several words. Except where otherwise stated the present text is from the first hand contemporary with the rest of the page and the making of the erasure must have preceded the writing of what follows it.

¹, ² and ³ The present reading indicated at the first writing; probably so at ⁶.

⁴ The present ' probably changed from a ה by the first hand. ;

⁵ A secondary reading indicated at the first writing.

⁷ Cf. the third word preceding.

⁸ The change was made before the word was finished, the ה now occupying the place of the erased ל.

⁹ A secondary reading indicated both at the first and the second writing, the one being the converse of the other.

GENESIS.

6:2, טובות, 17:6, במאד, 20:8, כל² 1st; 24:12, ויאמר, 26:13, ער², 31, וישלחם; 27:28, האלהים¹; 31:53, ישפט בינו²; 35:4, אתם²; 24, ובני²; 43:16, וידגן לרב, 46:8, בכור, 47:9, ימי² (3d); 17, בסוסים²; 48:16, וידגן לרב, 50:10, ועתה⁴; 17, אברהם²; 18, מספר.

EXODUS.

3:8, וארדה, 21, ונתתי, 14:30, שפת הים²; 15:19, ברכבו, 16:33, צנצנת; 18:25, ושפטתם²; 20:7, כי, 17, יהוה² (2d); 19, תאכלנוי, 21:35, אי² (2d); 23:31, את¹ (1st); 24:6, וחצי¹; 10, ויראו²; 25:14, בטבעות, 27:5, המזבח (1st); 28:30, את משפט, 31:12-14 (in part)⁵; 16, ושמרו, 33:11, ומשרתיו, 34:11, ואמה וחצי קומתו ויצפהו², 37:1, היו²; 36:29, המיטב²; 35:11, אשר, 35:11, וזר²; 39:36, כליו²; 40:19, את (3d).

LEVITICUS.

3:3, הקרב¹ (2d); 4:21, כאשר²; 5:2, ואיש²; 7:12, התודרה³; 8:16, המזבחה; 11:4, וממפרים, 5, השפן כי מעלה, 13:32, העור²; 35, פשה²; 14:13, קדש²; 15:5, במים²; 16, ואיש²; 16:3, הקדש, 19:16, גרים, 25:23, גרים, 38, להיות לכם, 54, ולא²; 26:26, ואם לא.

NUMBERS.

1:32, במספר, 3:3, המשחים, 33, משפחות¹; 4:11, תחש¹; 48, אלפים; 49, על² (1st); 5:22, חאשה²; 26, והרים⁶; 6:3, שכר²; 8:4, כמראה; 9, בנ²; 10:28, ויעש משה ואהרן וכל²; 19, 20, ולא, 19, 20, והקרב²; 11:10, ובעיני²; 13:1, אשר (3d); 20, הוא² (1st); 25, אשר²; 14:7, וידבר²; 15:11, בכשבים¹; 16:5, וירדב²; 19:10, וילך, 24:25, בם, 21:11, בם, 24:25, וילך, 26:12, הימיני, 29:20, מרעמס, 33:3, יעברו, 27, את²; 21, אל²; 31:2, שנים¹; 34:6, 7, לכם² (2d); 14, אבותם וחצי²; 35:5, פאת (3d); 16, וימת²; 19, הוא² (1st); 28, מות² (2d).

DEUTERONOMY.

1:7, בהר³; 20, אליכם³; 2:5, אלהינו³; 7, ער מדרך כף, 10, המדבר¹; 11, (all); 12, (1st 11 words); 36, היתה³; 3:26, ולא⁶; 4:47, אשר נשבע יהוה, 13, הוא, 7:9, ויירשו, 8:20, אלהים, 9:8, להשמיד²; 12:15, יאכלנו⁸; 15:6, והעבט¹; 18:14, ירשים, 22, הרבר (2d); 19:5, ונשל²; 20:19, מבוא מפניך במצור, 22:4, נפלים, 29, השכב, 23:4, גזול מלפניך ולא, 28:31, בטוב, 16, בצאתכם, 55, שעריך.

¹ An adjoining letter written at first where the one now over the erasure is.

² Apparently due to carrying out calaeographic principles, in most cases that of placing letters under similar letters in the preceding line.

³ Due to bringing out the cryptograms; so also perhaps ⁶.

⁴ ככב erased from the margin to the left of this word.

⁵ See HEBRAICA, Vol. IX., p. 220.

^{6, 7 and 8} Portions of these words (הרים, ל and אכלנ respectively) perhaps not contemporary.

כל (1st) of Num. 4:14, (? צוה of Num. 30:2) and אל (1st) of Deut. 9:26 were written twice, once at the end of a line and again at the beginning of the next line, and the former erased. Cf. Lev. 16:15 in Table I.

TABLE X.

The portion of the text of the first scribe that preceded כי עפר אתה of Gen. 3:19 and that that followed לשמע בקולו of Deut. 30:20 have been lost. The leaf that contained Gen. 11, from פן נפץ of verse 4 to the end of verse 23, has also disappeared.

In the following list the missing text is supplied in brackets from Blayney's edition. There can be no reasonable doubt that in most of the places where only part of a word has disappeared the reading was the same as that here given. Fragments of some of the letters remain but not enough to identify them with certainty.

GENESIS.

5:19, [חמ]ש, [וי]וליד, [28; [בן, [וי]חי, [29; [מ]מעשינו, [30; [וי]וליד, [32; [ע]ר, (1st) [א]שר, [7; [ו]יתעצב, [6; [יצר, [5; [בן, [6:1; [וי]וליד, [כ]י, [8; [חן, [9; [נח, [10; [את, [ש]לש[ה], [11; [ותמ]לא, [12; (1st and 2d) [וכפר]ת אתה, [ת]ובת עצי, [14; [והנ]ני, [ל]פני, [13; [ב]שר, [ה]נארץ, [15; [ר]וח, [ע]ל, [17; [ת]עשה, [ב]צרה, [א]מה, [16; [א]מה, [ה]תובה, [ת]עשה, [21; [ש]נים, [ל]מינהו, [20; [את]ך, [ה]בשר, [19; [ונ]שי, [ו]באת, [18; [ב]ארץ, [ת]קה, [2; [ל]פני, [ב]יתך, [ו]יאמר, 7:1; [נח כוכל, [22; [אל]ך, [קח, [ה]יקום, [ו]ארבעים, [א]נכי, [4; [על פני, [שבעה, [3; [זכור, [ה]בהמה, [על, [וי]חי, [10; (1st) [זמן, [8; [מ]פני, [ו]אשתו, [7; [מ]ים, [ו]נח, [6; [וי]עש, [5; [ה]יזקום, [23; [מ]כל, [22; [ה]אדם, [21; [מ]על, [17; [ת]הום, [ל]חדש, [ל]חיי, [11; [ה]שמים, (1st) [2; [ה]מים, 8:1; [יו]ם, [ו]יגבורו, [24; [ה]אנרץ, [ע]ר, (2d) [את, [8; [יבש]ת, [את, [7; [את, [6; [הלכו], 5; [ל]חדש, [4; [ה]מים, (1st) [ה]ארץ, [ש]לשה, [19; [ש]ם, [ו]יהיו, [18; [ב]ני, 9:17; [ופ]רו, [17; [רגל]ה, [9; [יירשך], 15:4; [וכנ]ען, [6; [בגו]הום, [ל]לשננו, [איני, [5; [תרשיש], 10:4; [עולום], [19; [אשתך], [15; [כ]ספך, [ת]מול, [13; [כסף], [כל], [12; [וב]ינכם, [ע]ר, [22; [ה]אחרת, [ת]לוד, [21; [גרו]ל, [ע]שור, [אתו], (2d) [שמעתוך], [20; [ש]לש, [א]ברהם, 18:6; [בהמ]לו, [25; [באנשי, [ילידי, [וי]קח, [23; [אתו], [עבד], 1¹, [53; [ו]ישתחי, [ו]יהי, [52; [ל]בן, [ר]בקה, [51; [ל]א, [50; [י]שכם, [ו]ילך, [אחריו], [61; [אברהם], [59; [ו]יהוה, [56; [א]שר, [54; [ת]לאמה, [ו]יתן, [ו]יאמר, [ה]איש, [65; [מ]על, [רבקה], [64; [עיניו], [יצחק], [63; [רא], 2¹, [62;

¹ Parchment sufficient to contain one letter lost from the right of the *y*. (Some manuscripts read העבר.)

[ברכתך], [ויאמר], 27:35, [אמ]ו, [את], [ויביא]ה, 67, [את], 66, [הצע]יף; 36, [בר]כה, [עתה לקח ברכתי], [פעמים], [ויעקבני], [ויאשר], 45, [חת אם לקח], [אל יצחק קצותני], 46, [גם שניכם יום], [לו ושלחתי], [ויחלם], 12, [ההוא], [מראישתו], [השמ]ש, 28:11, [כנאלה מבנות], [בית אלהים], [הזאת], [והאבן], 22, [בית], 21, [מגיע השמיים], 38:1, [בנימים], 43:16, [אפוי], 39:19, [ענינים], [ותתכם], 14, [ואחיו], 24, [לחם], [בצהריים], 25, [רגליהם].

EXODUS.

9:19, (3d) [הארץ]; 13:7, [גבולך]; 27:11, [כסף].

LEVITICUS.

6:22, [עשה], 23, [לא], 7:5, [הזבח], 6, [קרש].

² and ⁴ The damaged letter was probably י.

³ The initial letter accidentally rubbed out.

P. 124, Gen. 19:9, for ת read ט; p. 129, Gen. 43:25, add לחם X.; p. 134, Ex. 33:10, for ר read ד; p. 138, Lev. 26:16, add מכלות (B.) מכליות codex; p. 140, Num. 8:7, for VII. read הזה.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE EXODUS.

BY PROFESSOR NATHANIEL SCHMIDT,

Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

According to the Elohist, the Sons of Israel lived for three or four generations¹ among the Egyptians,² honored and supported at first,³ but subsequently enslaved and ill treated.⁴ From this oppression they were delivered through Moses, who with the rod of God⁵ smote the land of Egypt with five great plagues, viz.: blood in the river,⁶ hail,⁷ locusts,⁸ darkness⁹ and disease,¹⁰ then divided the waters of the Yam Suph,¹¹ caused the people to march through the sea, fought 'Amalek at Rephidim,¹² continued to Horeb, the mount of God,¹³ received Yithro, the priest of Midyan,¹⁴ settled at Kadeš and planned the conquest of the Amorite kingdom of Sihon.¹⁵ The Yahwist related that Israel once resided with flocks and herds in the province of Gošen¹⁶ and grew to be a great and mighty nation, feared by the Egyptians, who therefore forced them to supply brick and laborers for the building of the store-cities of Pithom and Ramses.¹⁷ Yahweh,

¹ Gen. I. 28; Ex. II. 1.

² Bacon seems to me correct in his view that in this document "we see the Hebrews still a mere clan quietly living in one of the cities of Egypt, the royal city, and scattered as individuals among the Egyptians' dwellings," *JBL*, X., 1891, p. 110. How, with his fine appreciation of E's consistency, Bacon can assign to him Ex. XII. 37b, Num. XI. 21, I cannot quite understand. "Slaves, not in a condition to own flocks and herds and crops" are scarcely in a position to "go forth like an army 600,000 strong, armed and with an high hand," *JBL*, IX., 1890, p. 93. With Kittel, *Geschichte*, p. 196, I assign these passages to P. Cf. also Addis, *The Oldest Book of Hebrew History*, 1893, p. 127.

³ Gen. XLVII. 12.

⁴ Ex. II. 1 sqq.

⁵ Ex. IV. 17, 20b *al*.

⁶ Ex. VII. 15, 17b, 20b, 23.

⁷ Ex. IX. 22, 23a, 25a.

⁸ Ex. X. 12, 13a, 14a, 15a β .

⁹ Ex. x. 20-23, 27.

¹⁰ The order in E was probably as follows: XI. 1-3; XII. 35, 36; this sentence וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה גִּזְּתָהּ עַל מֹשֶׁה נָטָה יָדְךָ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּדִבְרִי וַיִּפְּעוּ כָּמוֹת כָּל בֵּית בָּאָרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיָּמָת אֶת מִצְרַיִם עַל מֹשֶׁה נָטָה יָדְךָ עַל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם; then XII. 30a β b, 31a, 33 and 38a. For דָּבַר and the construction of פָּלַע, cf. Ex. V. 3 (vs. 1-4 belong to E).

¹¹ Ex. XIII. 18.

¹² Ex. XVII. 8-16.

¹³ Ex. XIX. 20.

¹⁴ Ex. XVIII. 1.

¹⁵ Num. XXI. 21-31.

¹⁶ All references to Gošen and to flocks and herds belong to J. On this important point I agree entirely with Bacon, *l. c*. A list in the temple at Denderah designates Kesem as the capital of the twentieth nome in Lower Egypt, called Sopt, Dümichen, *Rec.*, III., 65, 20. It is probable that LXX. had this in mind in rendering *Γεσημ*. Ptolemy calls the capital of *Αραβιας νομος*, *Φακονσσα*, and with this agrees the Coptic Fakos=pa Kos, the modern Tell Fakus. The name was, no doubt, extended from the city to the nomos in the form of Kos or Kosem. Cf. Dümichen, *Geographie d. alten Aegyptens*, 1887, p. 265; also Ebers in Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*, 1893-1894. If this identification is correct, the Gošen of Josh. x. 41; xi. 16, D², can scarcely be the same as the Gošen of J, as Bacon thinks, *l. c*. It may be a fertile strip of land west of the Negeb named after the Egyptian province; and the city of the same name, Josh. xv. 61, its capital.

¹⁷ Ex. I. 11, Pt Tūm, "the abode of Tūm," was the sacred name of the capital of Abnefer, the VIIIth nome in Lower Egypt, its civil name being Thukut = סִכּוּת, Ex. XII. 37a P. It was situated in the Wadi Tumilat where the modern Tell el Maskhuta is; cf. Naville, *The Store-City of Pithom*,³ 1888. Ramses has not yet been identified. Ebers, in Riehm, *Hdw.*, 1894, thinks of Tan,

however, sent Moses to demand of Pharaoh release, and upon his refusing to grant even a few days' leave of absence, smote Egypt with seven plagues, viz., pollution of the Nile water,¹⁸ frogs in the river,¹⁹ flies,²⁰ murrain,²¹ hail,²² locusts²³ and death of the firstborn,²⁴ in each case exempting the province of Gošen. Then he led the way in a pillar of cloud and fire to the Yam-Suph, laid bare the sea by a strong east wind,²⁵ gave Israel victory over the pursuing Egyptians and confused and drowned them in their retreat,²⁶ appeared in majesty on Mount Sinai²⁷ and ordered the conquest of Canaan. Guided by Hobab, the Midianite,²⁸ Israel marched to Kadeš, sent spies into Canaan,²⁹ was discouraged and moved about in the desert for forty years,³⁰ then settled in Šittim,³¹ crossed the Jordan and captured Jericho. Amos declared that Yahweh had brought Israel out of Egypt and led them forty years in the wilderness, and based an argument upon the admitted fact that throughout this period there were no sacrifices and religious processions such as characterized the cult of his own time.³² Hosea threatened Ephraim with a return to Egypt,³³ proclaimed Yahweh's love for Israel, his son, whom he had called out of Egypt,³⁴ called Yahweh Israel's god from Egypt and intimated that Israel had once lived in tents before entering Canaan.³⁵ Isaiah announced that Aššur would smite Israel with a rod "after the manner of Egypt" but that Yahweh subsequently would lift "his rod upon the sea against Aššur" after the manner of Egypt.³⁶ Micah proclaimed that Yahweh had brought his people up out of the land of Egypt, redeemed them from

Tanis, the עַן of Num. XIII. 22 E. But this city flourished already in the XIIth dynasty, and possibly as early as in the VIth. Lagarde, *Mitt.*, IV., 149 sqq. proposes פָּתִם רַעֲמָסִס in Ex. i. 11, and would understand "ר" as in "רָרִין", Gen. XLVII. 11 P. But there is no ground for supposing Ramesses to be another name for the VIIIth nome.

¹⁸ Ex. VII. 14, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25.

¹⁹ Ex. VII. 26 sqq.

²⁰ Ex. VIII. 16 sqq.

²¹ Ex. IX. 1-7.

²² Ex. IX. 13, 14a, 17, 18, 23b, 24, 25b, 26-34.

²³ Ex. x. 1-11, 13a/3b, 14a/3b, 15a/3b, 16-19.

²⁴ Ex. XI. 4-8; XII. 29 [30aa, וִיקָרָא, 31b, 32].

²⁵ Ex. XIV. 21b.

²⁶ Ex. XIV. 24 sqq. Cf. Weihausen, *JDTb.* XXI. p. 546.

²⁷ Ex. XIX. 9, 11, 16, 18, 20.

²⁸ Num. x. 29-32, cf. Kittel, *Gesch.*, p. 181.

²⁹ Num. XIII. 17b-19, 22, 27, 28.

³⁰ Num. XXXII. 13. Kuenen's reasoning, *Theol. Tijdschr.* XI., 1877, 545 sqq. failed to convince me that 5-13 is one of the latest *haggadic* fragments in the Pentateuch. In *Onderzoek*, 1887, p. 248, he at least assigns it to JE. With Dillmann and Kittel, I assign it to J. ³¹ Num. xxv. 1.

³² ix. 10; ix. 7; v. 25, 26. On the last passage, cf. my article in *JBL.*, XIII., 1894.

³³ ix. 3.

³⁴ xi. 1.

³⁵ xii. 10; מוֹעֵד should, in my judgment, be emended to קָרַם. That the Targum could have rendered the present text כִּימִי קָרַם, is to me inconceivable. מוֹעֵד may have been a gloss explaining the period referred to, probably designed to convey the idea of wandering, marching, cf. מוֹעֵד "band," "troop," Isa. xiv. 31. Some later reader or copyist would readily think of the feast of tabernacles and pronounce מוֹעֵד.

³⁶ x. 24, 26. Duhm, *Jesaja*, 1892, assigns x. 24-27a to the 2d century, pointing to "die Tendenz, die Tempelgemeinde zu trösten," to 26ba as "ein Ausdruck der besser zu einem Exegeten passt als zu einem Propheten" and to the preference since Ezekiel, "die Geschichte des Exodus als Themenstoff für Predigten zu verwerthen." But there is no reference to any "Tempelgemeinde;" the author of x. 5-7; xi. 1 sqq. knows well how to give comfort of this kind; poetic license may account for מוֹעֵד על הַיָּם instead of הַיָּם על הַיָּם, but scarcely exegetic ἀκρίβεια; E, J, Amos and Hosea had already used the Exodus and the wilderness period for parænetic purposes, and the style and the vocabulary are Isaiah's.

bondage, sent before them Moses, Aaron and Miriam, and frustrated through Balaam the plans of Balak, king of Moab.³⁷ According to the Deuteronomist, Yahweh took Israel out of the midst of Egypt, with signs and wonders, with battle and great power,³⁸ spoke to the people from the fire on Mount Horeb,³⁹ led them to Kadeš Barne'a and thence in thirty-eight years to Zered,⁴⁰ supplied them miraculously with food and clothing all through the forty years' period⁴¹ and finally gave them the Amorite kingdoms of Sihon and Og.⁴² Jeremiah praised the love shown by Israel and the faithfulness of Yahweh in the wilderness⁴³ and declared that Yahweh gave no commands concerning sacrifices at the time he brought them out of the land of Egypt.⁴⁴ Ezekiel held that Israel and Judah had once been in Egypt and there learnt idolatrous practices.⁴⁵ A Deuteronomistic hand in 1 Kgs. vi. 1 penned the statement that the building of Solomon's temple began in the four hundred and eightieth year after the Exodus. Partly on the basis of earlier documents, the Priestly Writer related, that Israel sojourned in Egypt 430 years;⁴⁶ was delivered through Moses and Aaron who with his rod performed five great wonders, viz., transformation of the rod into a serpent,⁴⁷ change of water into blood,⁴⁸ frogs,⁴⁹ flies,⁵⁰ and boils,⁵¹ of which the Egyptian magicians could perform only three; marched 600,000 strong from Ramses to Sukkoth,⁵² Etham,⁵³ Pi Hahiroth⁵⁴ and the Yam Suph and through this sea to Sinai where an elaborate code was given and a magnificent cult instituted; and from Sinai proceeded by easy stages⁵⁵ to Paran where the conquest of Canaan was planned.

From these data the conclusion may be drawn that, in the period of the two kingdoms, there was among the Israelitish tribes a widespread⁵⁶ tradition that

³⁷ vi. 3, 4, מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם עַר הַגִּבְלִי is more likely to be a remnant of a more complete sentence than a gloss in Ewald's sense. Wellhausen has no explanation to offer for its interpolation here, *Skizzen*, v. 144.

³⁸ iv. 34. ³⁹ i. 6 sqq. ⁴⁰ ii. 14. ⁴¹ i. 30, 31; xxix. 4, 5. ⁴² ii. 24 sqq.; iii. 1 sqq.

⁴³ ii. 2, 6, 7. ⁴⁴ vii. 22, cf. xvi. 14. ⁴⁵ xxxiii. 3, 19, 27. ⁴⁶ ex. xii. 40. ⁴⁷ ex. vii. 1-13.

⁴⁸ ex. vii. 19, 20aa, 22. ⁴⁹ ex. viii. 1-3, 11ayb. ⁵⁰ ex. viii. 12-15. ⁵¹ ex. ix. 8-12.

⁵² ex. xii. 37.

⁵³ ex. xiii. 20. Naville, *l. c.*, p. 28, identifies אֶתֶם with the Atuma or Atima of Pap. Anastasi VI., 4, regarding it as a region and not a city. Rougé, Chabas and Brugsch (even *Aegyptologie*, 1889, p. 37) transcribed it Edom and referred it to the Biblical Edom. Naville's objection that "it is an anachronism to admit the existence of a land of Edom in the XIIth dynasty" assumes a knowledge we do not possess of the origin of the name and the nation of Edom.

⁵⁴ ex. xiv. 2. Naville, *l. c.*, p. 30, identifies פִּי־חִירֹת with Pikerehet, found in the tablet of Ptolemy Philadelphus, combining the LXX. *επανλς* with the *ah* of Anast. VI. It is, indeed, difficult to see why the Alexandrian should have given this translation, if the Hebrew word had not suggested to him a place familiarly known as "the farm house." But it is not certain that he knew just where the ancient Pi Hahiroth was. Naville admits that Pikerehet "must have been an important place judging from the amount of taxes which the kings attribute as revenue to its temple," p. 15. Is it likely that such a city should have been known as "the farm house?" There is no evidence that the particular *ah* of Anast. VI. was either Pikerehet, Pi Hahiroth or the farm building of which the Alexandrian thought.

⁵⁵ Num. xxxiii. 1-49. For the genesis and growth of these itineraries compare the excellent observations of Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*, 1893, p. 168 sqq.

⁵⁶ We are scarcely in a position to assert that it was universal even then; but the political unity of David's and Solomon's time no doubt made common property of many a tale that until then had lived on the lips of single tribes.

their ancestors had once been in Egypt but escaped from this house of bondage and lived awhile on the Sinaitic peninsula, previous to the conquest of Canaan. It is also to be inferred that, at least towards the close of this period, centuries were thought to lie between Solomon and the Exodus and other centuries between the Exodus and Joseph. This would point to the time of the XVIIIth and XIXth dynasties as the epoch of the sojourn in Egypt, the life in the desert, and the conquest of Palestine.

Fortunately, this is just the time when we would most hopefully look to Egypt, Sinai and Palestine for testimony concerning the Hebrew tribes. From Aahmes (1579-1557)⁵⁷ to Ramessu IV. (1203-1192) Egyptian armies were constantly marching through the Eastern Delta on their way to Palestine; official couriers and travelers passed to and fro between these countries, and numerous records of campaigns, reports, letters and memoirs have come into our possession.

During the same period, Ma'in Mişran, Ma'in, Maon, Midyan and 'Amalek dwelt on the Sinaitic peninsula, in the Syrian desert and in Northern Arabia. Some of these knew well how to record important events, as the Minaean inscriptions show.

How long before the reign of Amenhotep III. (1437-1401) the cuneiform script and the Babylonian language were used in Palestine, cannot be determined at present. Nor have we any data for ascertaining whether the wedge-shaped characters fell into disuse when the diplomatic relations between Egypt and Palestine ceased. But for more than a generation there certainly was considerable literary activity in the centres of Amorite life. Unless a very marked deterioration of this race took place, such as the Hebrew records scarcely warrant us in assuming, it is more likely that the wedge-writing was retained by the Amorite scribes until the alphabet became known than that so useful an art should have been suddenly dropped.

Increasing knowledge of this period justifies the hope for direct testimony from those so immediately concerned in the movements of the Hebrew tribes, and so capable of rendering an account of themselves and of their neighbors. The more reliance we place upon the details of the Hebrew tradition, the more remarkable would be their silence.

Is there any such testimony? Chabas⁵⁸ first called attention to the Aperiu or Apri appearing as carriers of stone in two letters from the time of Ramessu II.

⁵⁷ These dates are based on the native sources, the synchronism with Babylonian kings furnished by the Amarna correspondence and the astronomical calculations of Mahler. On the basis of Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III., 43e, Mahler determined the date of Tehutimes III. as extending from March 20th, 1503 to February 14th, 1449; *Chronol. Vergleichungstabellen*, Wien, 1888, p. 39. If it is not absolutely certain, internal evidence strongly points to a composition of this fragment in the same reign as that of III. 43f. where Tehutimes' name occurs. He also determined the date of Ramessu II. as extending from 1348 to 1281. Cf. *ZÄS.*, 1889, p. 97; 1890, p. 32. Meyer is sufficiently convinced to commend a slight change in his former dates and to suggest Amenhotep I. as the king of *Papyrus Ebers*; cf. *Geschichte des Altertums*, II., Stuttgart, 1893, p. 131.

⁵⁸ *Mélanges Egyptologiques*, Châlon sur Saône, 1864, II., 148.

(1348-1281), one from Kausir to Bakh-en-Ptah,⁵⁹ and another from Keni Amen to Hui.⁶⁰ The reading Aperiu was also suggested in a somewhat blurred text from the beginning of the reign of Mer-en-Ptah (1281-1269), where this king is represented as vanquishing them with his arms.⁶¹ The identification with the Hebrews was confidently proposed⁶² and widely accepted.⁶³ Perhaps the most comprehensive and vigorous defense, from the old point of view, was that of Waldemar Schmidt.⁶⁴ But further research brought difficulties. It was discovered that these Aperiu were in Egypt when, according to the theory, they ought not to be there. As late as in the days of Ramessu IV. (1203-1192) "Aperiu 800 in number" are mentioned in the Hamamat inscription.⁶⁵ They are there called Aperiu of An or Aian, the mountainous district east of Memphis extending to the Red Sea. And as early as in the time of Neferhotep, of the XIIIth dynasty (c. 2200) they meet us as sailors in Egypt.⁶⁶ In the thousand years intervening they are found occasionally in a different rôle. Thus in the reign of Tehutimes III. (1503-1449) some of this people are presented as messengers mounting their horses at the king's command;⁶⁷ and in a document from the time of Ramessu III. (1235-1203) we learn that 2083 Aperiu were settled near Heliopolis. They are introduced as "knights, sons of the kings and noble lords [marina] of the Aperiu, settled people dwelling in this place."⁶⁸ In view of these facts it was thought impossible to maintain the identification and most scholars beat a hasty retreat. The only remarkable thing about this change of position was the quiet assumption of knowledge that led to it. Wiedemann announced that the Aperiu were in the land "long before the arrival of the Jews in Egypt,"⁶⁹ as if all the world knew just the year and the day when Hebrew tribes first began to assemble on the frontiers of Egypt. Brugsch took offense at the thought that any of the forebears of the prophets should ever have sat on horseback, and was at a loss to explain how Hebrew clans could have resided as honored men near Heliopolis in the days of Ramessu III.⁷⁰ Max Duncker was quite certain that the Hebrews could not have been known to the Egyptians as Apri or Ibri, since we know Ibrim to mean "die Jenseitigen."⁷¹ Even Eduard Meyer, convinced by Brugsch's investigations that the Aperiu were a people living in the Erythræan district of An, declared the identification without a foundation.⁷² Of course, if we know just when Hebrew tribes drifted into Egyptian territory, how they occupied

⁵⁹ *Leyden Papyrus*, I., 348. ⁶⁰ *Leyden Papyrus*, I., 349.

⁶¹ *Papyrus Anastasi*, III., last letter. ⁶² Chabas, *Mélanges*, and *Recherches*, Paris, 1873.

⁶³ Cf. Naville, *Les Israélites en Égypte*, in *Revue Chrétienne*, 1878.

⁶⁴ *Assyriens og Ægyptens gamle historie*, Kjøbenhavn, 1877, 878 sqq.

⁶⁵ Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III., 219e. ⁶⁶ Mariette, *Abydos*, II., 39, 13. ⁶⁷ *Pap. Harris*, 500 verso.

⁶⁸ Chabas, *Voyage d'un Égyptien*, p. 211.

⁶⁹ *Ägyptische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1884-1888, p. 491.

⁷⁰ *Z.A.S.*, 1876, p. 71; *Geschichte Ägyptens*, 541, 582 sqq.

⁷¹ *Geschichte des Altertums*, Leipzig, 1878, I., 387.

⁷² *Geschichte des Altertums*, Stuttgart, 1884, p. 288.

themselves there, what name they bore and what it signified, and can be sure that these sons of the desert never sat on horseback and never bolted or lagged behind, or slunk back to the fleshpots of Egypt, these arguments are convincing. But are we really so well informed as that? The only serious objection against the identification was raised by Meyer, when, a few years after his first utterance, he announced that "die 'apru sind überhaupt kein Volk, das Wort bedeutet Arbeiter."⁷³ It is difficult, however, to believe that the Egyptians should have used the same word to designate a sailor, a stone-carrier, a mounted courier, a warrior, and a mighty lord. If Apri is the true reading in Anast. III. 7, Mer-en Ptah would then boast of a glorious victory over a body of laboring men (!) Worst of all, the author of the Harris papyrus would *ex hypothesi* call these "laborers," "sons of kings and noble lords." Perchance as a compliment to their versatility?⁷⁴ On the other hand, Brugsch, in his last work,⁷⁵ comes to the conclusion that "es ist immer noch eine unentschiedene Frage ob die... 'pr'w Ebräer sind oder nicht;" and he refers to the Heroopolitan district, 'An, where the Pitum known to Hebrew tradition and so brilliantly discovered by Naville was situated, as "dasselbe Gebiet von welchem die 'pr'w (Ebräer?) versetzt wurden." The Aperiu may, indeed, have been a different people from the Hebrews;⁷⁶ but no reasons have yet been adduced that conclusively forbid the identification.

These foreigners first appear in Egypt in an era of migratory movements, possibly in the very century that witnessed the Palestinian expeditions of Kudur Mabuk and Hammurabi (2240-2186), possibly the Amraphel of Gen. XIV.,⁷⁷ who, according to the same source, was accompanied by Kudur La'amar,⁷⁸ Ariokh = Eri Agu⁷⁹ and Tid'al⁸⁰ and was a contemporary of Abram,⁸¹ the Hebrew.⁸² Push-

⁷³ *Geschichte des alten Aegyptens*, Berlin, 1887, p. 297.

⁷⁴ I can attach no significance to the absence of the determinative for foreigner in some instances. In *Pap. Leyden*, I., 348 it occurs, while in *Pap. Leyden*, I., 349, it is absent; yet the context is exactly the same. The ordinary word for "laborer," bak, Copt. bok, occurs alongside of Apri in these texts.

⁷⁵ *Die Aegyptologie*, Leipzig, 1889-1891, pp. 38, 39.

⁷⁶ One would be tempted, in that case, to think of the Midianite people עֶפְרָי, Gen. xxv. 4, J or of Assurbanipal's Apparu., V R. 9. 27 with whom Glaser connects this עֶפְרָי, *Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, Berlin, 1890, p. 446. This may, indeed, be the remnant of a larger Sinaitic people including some Midianite clans and some clans afterwards entering into the composition of the בני ישראל.

⁷⁷ Even Winckler now admits that Martu (Aḥarru) always refers to "das Westland" and .hat Ammisatana and Hammurabi held possession of Palestine, *Alt. Forschungen*, II., 1894, p. 143 sqq. The identification is accepted by Schrader, *Bab. Königsliste*, 25, 26; Halévy, *REJ.*, XV., 168 sqq.; Zimmern, *Die Assyriologie als Hilfswissenschaft*, 10. Less probable is Hommel's Amarpal (LXX.) = Amar muballit = Sin muballit, father of Hammurabi, *Geschichte Bab. und Ass.*, 366.

⁷⁸ כְּרִלְעֶמֶר has not been found on any inscription; but the name is so "echt Elamitisch." that Meyer gives him a place beside Kudur Mabuk, and regards the chapter as written by a Jew in Babylon on the basis of historical study, *Geschichte des Altertums*, I., p. 165 sqq.

⁷⁹ For this identification see the convincing arguments of Hommel, *Gesch.*, p. 357 sqq.

⁸⁰ גוּתִי possibly corrupted from גוּתִי = Guti. According to Hilprecht, *Old Bab. Inscr.*, p. 12 sqq., this kingdom already existed in the days of Sargon I. But cf. Halévy, *Revue Sém.*, 1894

ing into the land, some of their number, as well as Phoenicians and other aliens, were hired for marine service. What their fortunes were during the Hyksos period, is not known. But in the XVIIIth dynasty we find Aperiu familiar with the use of the horse just then putting in his appearance in Egypt. This seems to point to some connection with Syria and Mesopotamia, or at least with the Semitic tribes mediating the traffic with those parts. In the Egyptian army that besieged Joppa it was the Aperiu that mounted their horses to carry royal messages. But whatever services of this nobler kind they rendered Tehutimes III., a new king arose that knew them not. For his great building enterprises Ramessu II. had need of these strangers and he put them to work as stone-carriers, and possibly as brick-makers.⁸³ Between Mer en Ptah (1281-1269) and Ramessu III. (1235-1203) a change took place in their position. Something of radical importance must have happened. For when the cloud lifts, they are seen in a peaceful settlement near Heliopolis and are referred to as "sons of kings and noble lords of the Apri." The most natural explanation of this seems to be that the former slaves had escaped from their bondage and risen to eminence in the time when the Palestinian Arsu⁸⁴ held sway over the country (1255-1242). Maintaining themselves in the reign of Ramessu III., they were no longer remembered as the sons of abject bondsmen but as the descendants of noble sires. *Tant va le monde!* But in their old haunts in the Mokattam mountains less successful kinsmen soon were reduced to slavery again.

Is there in all this anything that is incompatible with a reasonable conception of early Hebrew history? The Sons of Israel rightly regarded themselves as only a part of a larger family, the Hebrews, scattered all over Arabia and the Sinaitic peninsula. Some of their great mountain shrines were on this peninsula.⁸⁵

p. 279. Tad'al = Ta du gilu may, however, only point to a linguistic affinity between Gutian and Mittanian.

⁸¹ Whatever the original elements, this pericope was undoubtedly worked over in postexilic times. As to the character, age and extent of the source, we know nothing. The finds at El Amarna and El Hesi make an Amorite origin as probable as a Babylonian. To assert that Abram and Malkisedek never existed, as Meyer does, *l. c.*, is to assume more knowledge than we possess. On the other hand, Dillmann, *Genesis*⁸⁶ and Kittel, *Geschichte*, 158sq. have only shown a bare possibility.

⁸² The derivation of this name from the root עָבַר with the significance of "passieren, vorüberziehen, weiterziehen" as "wanderer," proposed by Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, Leipzig, 1881, p. 282, seems to me more probable than the ordinarily accepted view connecting the name with the passage of a river, either the Euphrates or the Jordan (so Stade and Meyer). The name of the Ge'ez people is a good analogy; Cf. Ludolf, *Hist. Aeth.* I., 1, 4; Dillmann, *Grammatik d. Aeth. Sprache*, p. 2; *Lexicon Aeth.*, p. 1188 s. v. Less felicitous is the proposed analogy to the Philistines. This people has been identified even by Meyer, *Gesch. Aeg.*, p. 316, with the Pulista or Pursta. Of the meaning of their name we are as ignorant as of their ethnic connection.

⁸³ *Pap. Anast.*, III.

⁸⁴ *Pap. Harris*, pl. 76. Cf. Eisenlohr, *Der grosse Papyrus Harris*, Leipzig, 1872.

⁸⁵ That Horeb and Sinai were the same mountain, cannot be asserted. The two traditions, ED, 1 Kgs. xix. 8, and Deut. xxxiii. 2, (Song of Moses,) JP, may point to two equally famous sanctuaries. That Yahweh was the god of Kayin, Midyan and possibly other Sina-

The Egyptian borderland no doubt had the same attraction for them as for other Semites.⁸⁶ That some of their clans should have established themselves in the Mokattam mountains, the Heroopolitan district, and the neighborhood of Heliopolis, is not at all unlikely. Like their kinsmen they certainly may have been pressed into service occasionally. It is only natural to suppose that, at a time when Egypt was suffering from dissension⁸⁷ and pestilence, some of these clans should have effected their escape. Nothing forbids the assumption that Hebrews in better circumstances declined to cast in their lot with Moses, that the unwonted hardships of the desert, the rigid discipline of the great leader and the first unsuccessful attempts at entering Palestine sent others back, that the disaffected elements united with the Palestinian hordes invading Egypt under Arsu and that a flourishing colony established itself in this period of foreign domination in their old home near Heliopolis. This is, at any rate, not a whit more strange or less probable than the course of Aperian history just outlined. But if the Egyptians designated as Aperiu the same people that the Israelites called Ibrim, there is no objection to supposing that among the Aperiu-Ibrim that escaped from Egyptian oppression there were some clans that afterwards became a part of the nation of Israel.⁸⁸ As to the Exodus, the Egyptian references would neither affirm, nor yet exclude, such an event; they would, however, indicate as its probable date some time between the end of Mer en Ptah's reign (1269) and Ramessu III's accession (1235), not long before the invasion of Arsu, in 1255.

Before leaving the Egyptian documents it may be well to inquire whether any references in later writers to this epoch, or to the Exodus of the Hebrews, may have been based upon reliable native sources. The number of Greek and Roman

ite tribes has been well shown by Tiele, *Vergl. Gesch.*, 1876, p. 558 sqq.; *Godsdiens in de Oudheid*, 1893, p. 280 sqq.; and Stade, *Gesch.*, 1889, p. 131; *Das Kainzeichen*, *ZATW.*, XIV., 1894, p. 250 sqq. Yithro, Re'uel and Hobab whom, with Tiele, I regard as priestly representatives of Midianite and Kenite clans, probably joined with Moses in Yahweh worship at Horeb, or at Sinai, or at both these places, because they had often worshiped him there before and the power of their god had been signally manifested. Sinai was, no doubt, originally dedicated to Sin; for while the Min-Sab. 𐤎 with which the name is written, Osiander 29, 5, generally corresponds to an Aram.-Heb. ש rather than a ס , I doubt whether it can be laid down as an absolute rule, as Hommel does, *Südarabische Chrest.*, 1893, p. 10. But that would not prevent Kayin from habitually worshiping Yahweh there, any more than Israel scrupled to worship Yahweh at the old sanctuary on Carmel. The Ephraemitic designation of Horeb as a הר אלהים also points to it as a "Götterberg."

⁸⁶ Cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. alt. Aegyptens*, p., 297 sqq.

⁸⁷ Is there an intimation of political disaffection in Ex. XII. 38a, E?

⁸⁸ This is admitted to be the historical nucleus of the later Hebrew accounts even by Stade, *Geschichte*, p. 129 "Es sind gewichtige Gründe vorhanden welche uns zu der Annahme zwingen dass einzelne hebräische Stämme oder Geschlechter in Aegypten sich aufgehalten und unter Mose sich befreit;" and by Meyer, *Geschichte d. alt. Aeg.*, p. 298 "irgend einer der Stämme aus denen die Nation der Söhne Israels zusammengefloßen ist, hat einmal in den Grenzgebieten des Nillandes gezelet und die Erinnerung davon bewahrt." That the identification would carry with it the historicity of the Hebrew narratives, as Honorato del Val, El Pentateuco, in *La Ciudad de Dios*, 1893, p. 180 sqq., seems to think, cannot be maintained.

historians who agree that the Jews once resided in Egypt, but in some way, at some time, were driven out of the country, is indeed considerable. Such names as Hecataeus of Abdera, Manetho, Poseidon, Lysimachus, Chæremon, Pompejus Trogus, Strabo, Diodorus, Plutarch, and Tacitus, have a good sound. But even their combined testimony has little weight. The later writers depend on the earlier, and some of these may easily have picked up their crumbs of learning in the Jewish Ghetto at Alexandria. The only authors that can be seriously considered are Hecataeus of Abdera and Manetho of Sebennytos. No doubt the number of Jews in Egypt at the time of Ptolemy I. (306-283) was not small. The persons upon whom Hecataeus depended for his knowledge may have derived information from the Jews. But they themselves could scarcely have told him that their fathers were driven out of Egypt because the gods were angry with them and that the common mass of the expelled became their ancestors while the flower of the people went to Hellas.⁸⁹ On the other hand, it is difficult to say what native traditions reported to him may have led to his view. That such existed bearing on this point, seems evident from the accounts of Manetho.⁹⁰ Whether this learned priest took his story from the mouth of the people, or, as is more likely, from written documents,⁹¹ its thoroughly native character cannot be denied. Meyer says: "Die Art der Erzählung ist ächt ägyptisch. Die Geschichte könnte direct aus einem hieratischen Papyrus des neuen Reichs übersetzt sein,"⁹² and his judgment on this point is of the greatest value. *Αμενωφης του Παπιου* was identified by Erman as Amenhotep, the famous son of Hapi, *pa* being the masculine article and *apis* = Hapi.⁹³ This naturally led Meyer to regard *Αμενωφης ο βασιλευς* as Amenhotep IV., and the whole story as embodying a later conception of "the revolution Khu en Aten's apostasy from the old faith called forth." Amenophis = Amenhotep certainly seems to me more probable than Wiedemann's Amenophis = Amenmerisetneht.⁹⁴ It may even be that the elegant phrase, *ἐπιδυμειν Οεων γενεσθαι Θεατης*, which Josephus so needlessly ridicules, was coined in sympathetic North Egyptian priestly circles as a euphemism for the solar monotheism of Khu en Aten. But Wiedemann, in my judgment correctly, maintains that the substance of the story is the memory of a time like that depicted in the Harris papyrus, pl. LXXVI., rather than that of Khu en Aten. The iconoclasts and oppressors are the strangers, and not Amenophis-Khu en

⁸⁹ Hecataean fragment in *Diodorus*, XL., 3.

⁹⁰ Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, I., 26-31. The suspicion that 26 sqq. were derived from a pseudo-Manethonian work does not appear to be well founded.

⁹¹ Even if these documents should go back to the XXth dynasty, it is of course possible that the words translated *μετεθε το ονομα και προσηγορευθη Μωυσης* were inserted by some learned scribe in the days of Šešenk or even the Napata kings, when there was a sufficiently close contact with Judæa to account for the identification.

⁹² *Geschichte d. alt. Aeg.*, p. 276.

⁹³ *ZÄS.*, 1877, p. 147 sqq.

⁹⁴ *Ägyptische Geschichte*, 1884, p. 493. *Ραμψης* may have referred in the original to Ramessu III., but Manetho evidently thought of Ramessu Mer Amen (66 years).

Aten. In Manetho as in the Harris papyrus there is a Palestinian invasion. Theological considerations may have rounded out the picture and located it in a wrong time. How was this humiliation of Egypt to be accounted for? The presumptuous course of Amenhotep IV. was known to have brought in a period of national disaster. But the wise son of Hapi, living about that time, must have seen beforehand the coming calamity and warned the king. Eliminating this later element, and also some evident reminiscences of the expulsion of the Hyksos under Aahmes,⁹⁵ the rest seems to be a duplicate of the sad story in the Harris papyrus. With this addition, however, that certain aliens already in the land are described as lepers, connected with the Hyksos in Jerusalem and said to be governed by Osarsiph-Moses rather than by Arsu. Egyptian feeling may have vented itself in the somewhat inelegant nickname of "lepers" given to this people, scarcely on the ground of their "ceremonial uncleanness"⁹⁶ i. e. their different rules of taboo, rather than because of numerous and obnoxious cases of elephantiasis or other cutaneous diseases among them. With our present knowledge of the history of Jerusalem, it is no longer improbable that the expelled Hyksos fell upon Palestine and took possession of its chief city.⁹⁷ It is now generally admitted that the Hyksos were Semites and not improperly designated as Arabs.^{97b} The Palestinian hordes invading Egypt under Arsu may well have been taken to be the descendants of these Hyksos. Nor would it be strange, if some in reality were so. Manetho explains the name *Οσαρσιφ* *απο του εν Ηλιον πολει Θεου Οσιρεως*. He evidently took him to be a native. But Egyptian deities were known and worshiped in Syria as early as in the fifteenth century,⁹⁸ particularly Hesiiri and Tehuti. Yet it is more probable that the name, being in reality Arsu,⁹⁹ was Egyptianized by a later writer, familiar with the event, but not with pap. Harris. That this man assumed the name of Moses, cannot be an interpolation of Josephus; for this identification of Moses with Osarsiph seems to him the

⁹⁵ As such must be characterized the memory of *Avapis*, the Hatwaret of the inscriptions, cf. Brugsch, *Die Aegyptologie*, pp. 34-36, and also the close connection with Ethiopia at that time, for Aahmes' queen was an Ethiopian, cf. Wiedemann, *Gesch.*, p. 313 and it is not unreasonable to suppose that her kinsmen aided in the expulsion of the Hyksos.

⁹⁶ So Wiedemann, *Geschichte*, p. 495.

⁹⁷ After centuries of settled life in Egypt, during which their leaders held control of the nation and their upper classes no doubt adopted Egyptian civilization, it is not likely that they returned to nomadic life, but vastly more probable that they sought a new home for themselves in Palestine, this *צבי לכל הארצות*. Agumkakrime (c. 1600-1570) was scarcely in a position to prevent this. The Babylonian ascendancy in Palestine, of which the inscriptions of Hammurabi and Ammisatana (2147-2134), and only less directly the language of the Amarna tablets, bears testimony, must have been lost in the time of the later Uruazagga kings. Hani is to be sought in the Median mountains.

^{97b} Cf. G. Steindorff, *Zur Geschichte der Hyksos*, Leipzig, 1894.

⁹⁸ Cf. the letter from the inhabitants of Tunip to Amenhotep IV., No. 41 of the Tell el Amarna Tablets in the British Museum, London, 1892.

⁹⁹ So Wiedemann, *Geschichte*, p. 493.

crowning proof of Manetho's untrustworthiness.¹⁰⁰ Manetho may have heard something of Moses and inserted him in what he deemed a suitable place. But why should he have ascribed to Moses such a career? Hebrew tradition certainly knew nothing of a Moses holding possession of Egypt through a number of years, pillaging the cities, violating the temples and discharging the priests. It seems to have been in native lore he found the two figures, the Heliopolitan priest Moses, the leader of an alien race in their successful revolt, and the Palestinian conqueror Osarsiph (Arsu), the dictator of Egypt, blended into one personality by the simple device of a change of name. If this tradition rests on a reliable foundation, (and it is difficult to see any motive for its invention by the Egyptians themselves) we are again directed to the time immediately preceding Setneht for the Exodus. Whatever its strength or weakness, this appears to be all the direct testimony Egypt has to offer.¹⁰¹

Speaking of Aahmes' war of deliverance, Davis and Cobern say: "The only text which at all connects the Israelites with this war is the Minaean inscription (Halévy, 535) which, according to Dr. Eduard Glaser's translation, speaks of the "Hebrews of the canal country" giving thanks to the gods for their deliverance during a time of civil war."¹⁰² Later researches led Glaser to the view that the inscription commemorates the successful escape from Egypt of certain Minaeans belonging to the Hyksos at the time when these were expelled by Aahmes, that the Ma'in Mişran are Egyptian Minaeans, and that Šar, Ašur and Ibru naharan point to the isthmus of Suez, the Wadi el Ariş and the Mediterranean coast as their home.¹⁰³ Hommel at first assigned the inscription to the same period,¹⁰⁴ but afterwards dated it in the time of the conflict between Arsu and Setneht.¹⁰⁵ The inscription was found at Barakiş, the ancient Yathil (يثيل),¹⁰⁶ and records the building and dedication of some structure to Athtar (عثنر), Wadd (ود) and Nakrah (نكرح) by Ammişadik (عمصدق) and Sa'd (سعد), designated

¹⁰⁰ *Contra Apionem*, I., 31. It would be interesting to know, however, how the name was spelled in Manetho's work and in his original source, if there at all. The excerptors naturally cared for its correct spelling.

¹⁰¹ In Davis' and Cobern's *Ancient Egypt*, p. 44, there is a reference to a black jasper ring found at Tanis and dating from the Hyksos period, which has a Hebrew inscription. In reply to an inquiry, Dr. Davis writes me: "In 1878 there was exhibited in London the Egyptian collection of M. Allemant. The catalogue of this collection refers to this ring as follows: 'No. 705 San-Tanis. Black jasper. Stone of ring or seal graven in intaglio (gravé en creux) on both sides. On the front a winged serpent and two Semitic signs; on the back a Hebrew inscription. Epoch of the shepherd-kings, XVIIth dynasty.' Unfortunately the signs and inscriptions are not given, and I do not know what has become of the collection." If this "Hebrew inscription" appears in the characters used on the Siloam stone, the pre-exilic seals and the Maccabæan coins, it would be difficult to assert that it was made by Hebrews, unless this name should occur. Fenhu were in Egypt already in the sixteenth century. If the Aramæan characters are used, the ring cannot belong in the Hyksos period. The Allemant collection ought to be looked up.

¹⁰² *Ancient Egypt*, p. 45; Glaser, *Skizze*, I., 1889, 57 sqq.

¹⁰³ *Skizze*, II., 1890, p. 451 sqq.

¹⁰⁴ *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen*, 1892, p. 10.

¹⁰⁵ *l. c.*, p. 127; *Chrestomathie*, 1893, p. 104.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Müller, *Burgen*, II., p. 58 sqq. Mordtmann, *ZDMG.*, XLVII., 1893, p. 408; Hommel *Chrest.*, p. 135.

as *עבר נהרן* and the Ma'inu Mišran (معن مصرن), in recognition of help given them at a time when they had been attacked by bands of Saba'u and Haulanu, while war raged between Ma'in (معن) and Raghmat (رغمة)¹⁰⁷ and between the king of Yamnat (يمنة) and the king of Ša'mat (شامة)¹⁰⁸ and because of deliverance out of the midst of Mišr (بن وسط مصر) while there was hostility between Maḏay (مذى)¹⁰⁹ and Mišr, in the reign of Abiyada' Yathi' (أبيدع يثع), king of Ma'in and Mawan (ماوان).¹¹⁰ Glaser and Hommel are undoubtedly right in referring Mišr¹¹¹ and Ma'in Mišran to Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula respectively, and in seeking for Šar, Ašr and Ibru Naharan in the neighborhood of Egypt. Hommel points out that *أأشر* is a broken plural of *أشر*,¹¹² and that consequently this word indicates the 'Ašrites, but goes on to identify them as *אשורים* and the other two words as *صر* = T'ar and *عبر نهرن* = "das Ufergelände des Stromes" or "das jenseitige Ufer des Stromes," i. e. the Red Sea. I regard it more probable that Ammišadik and Sa'd, as governors under Abiyada' Yathi' over the Ma'inu Mišran, ruled the Šar-people living in the district of the fortress T'ar, the Ašer people¹¹³ living on the Mediterranean coast, and the *עבר* people living near the Red Sea. As to these *עבר נהרן*, their name presents a striking analogy to *معن مصرن*. If the latter are Egyptian Minaeans, why should not the former be Red Sea Aperiu, or even Hebrews? In one case, as in the other, the second word would designate them as only a part of a larger family. The restoration of native rule may well have forced some Tarite, Ašerite, and Aperian families to betake themselves else-

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Mordtmann, *l. c.*, p. 408, note.

¹⁰⁸ According to Hommel, South and North, Upper and Lower Egypt, Setneht and Arsu. Adhering substantially to the ordinary significance of the two terms, I would suggest that the king of Ša'mat was Šulmanuašaridu I. (ca. 1250-1220) and the king of Yamnat, Abiyada' Yathi' against whose Sinaitic province the Mušri expedition was directed.

¹⁰⁹ The identification of these with the Maḏoy (*Copt. Mati*) seems to me extremely doubtful. If, as Ebers avers, in Hommel, *Aufs.*, p. 128, "die Polizeitruppe der Maḏoy" were likely to aid Setneht against Arsu, how could the writer who knows of two fighting kings in Egypt substitute this police force for the victorious "king of the south," and regard them as fighting with Egypt?

¹¹⁰ *ماوان* = Magan = Sinaitic peninsula, according to Hommel. Then it is best to consider Ma'in Mišran only as the part of this peninsula immediately adjoining Egypt.

¹¹¹ Winckler, *Altorient. Forschungen*, I., 1893, p. 24 sqq., thinks of a North Arabian country, also called Mušri, the existence of which II R. 67, 56 forces him to assume. It would not be strange, if an Assyrian scribe should have regarded Egypt as beginning at the Wadi el Arīš which even the Hebrews called *נחל מצרים*. Idibi'il may well have been made governor over a part of the Sinaitic peninsula which a court historian would not scruple to call Mušur. It is scarcely necessary to suppose a separate kingdom with the same name.

¹¹² *Aufsedtze*, p. 8.

¹¹³ *אשור* = *أشور*? The name of the people may have been derived from its god.

where. But is it possible that this inscription can date from the thirteenth century?¹¹⁴ The discovery of a Minaean inscription in Egypt that seems to belong to the reign of Ptolemy II. (283-247) is now declared by Halévy to have "détruit l'hypothèse qui fait remonter le royaume minéen d'Arabie avant la fondation du royaume sabéen."¹¹⁵ But who has ever denied that there was in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus a Minaean people? All the world knew that from Eratosthenes. And what is there in this inscription that even hints at the existence of a Minaean kingdom? Halévy himself has well shown that the only word that would in the remotest way indicate a political connection with South Arabia does not mean at all "l'administrateur de la communauté yéménite," as Derenbourg translated,¹¹⁶ but simply "calamus."¹¹⁷ That the Sa'al form سَعْر should have maintained itself through seven centuries is not more strange than its longer maintenance in Assyrian and Mandaic. On the other hand there is no sign of mimation. تل ميث = Πτολεμαίος seems certain, and is supported by ائحرف. Whatever the interpretation given to Hal. 535, it remains a valuable testimony of how easily Semitic tribes would drift into Egypt, how completely they were able to retain their own worship, language and script, and how successfully they could escape at certain times and form alliances in the desert. It at least suggests the possibility of some Hebrew tribes living in Egypt without being much influenced by Egyptian civilization, casting in their lot with the Šasu when they were in power, faring with them in their adversity and perchance also pushing their way with them into Palestine in the beginning of the sixteenth century, thus offering a reasonable explanation of the facts now claiming our attention.

In the Amarna tablets several passages have been understood to contain references to the Hebrews. The Ḥabiri mentioned frequently in the Palestinian letters now in Berlin¹¹⁸ have been identified as Hebrews by Zimmern¹¹⁹ and others. Milkili and mare Milkili,¹²⁰ Labawi and mare Labawi,¹²¹ were explained as early representatives of the tribes of Ašer, among whom there was a clan Malkiel, Num. xxvi. 45, and Levi, respectively, by Morris Jastrow, Jr.,¹²² Scheil¹²³ called attention to the Yaudu appearing in one letter,¹²⁴ and Jastrow

¹¹⁴ Glaser, *Skizze*, I. and II., developed the historical reasons for supposing the kings of Ma'in to have reigned before the Sabaean kingdom. Hommel, *Aufsätze und Chrestomathie*, fortified these with linguistic reasons, such as the Sa'al and the su, sa, sumu vs. Sab. Hafal, hu, ha, humu (cf. on this point also Vollers, *ZA.*, IX., 189 sqq.), the double writing of a middle radical and the enclitic ى with a perfect in Min. and only the oldest Sab. Winckler, l. c., p. 36 has been convinced. So also the learned reviewer in *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1894, Apr. 28. On the other hand, Müller, *Allg. Zeitung*, No. 31, 1890; Mordtmann, *ZDMG.*, XLIV., 182; Halévy, *Revue Sém.*, 1894, p. 95, oppose this view, and Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, II., 1893, p. 382 expresses doubt.

¹¹⁵ *Revue Sém.*, 1894, p. 95.

¹¹⁶ *JA.*, 1893, Dec., p. 519.

¹¹⁷ *Revue Sém.*, 1894, p. 179 sqq.

¹¹⁸ Winckler-Abel, *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna*, Berlin, 1889-90, 102, 103, 104, 106, 199.

¹¹⁹ *Palestina um das Jahr 1400 v. Chr.*, in *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palestina Vereins*, XIII., 133-147. Cf. also Tiele, *Godsdienst in de Oudheid*, 1893, p. 285.

¹²⁰ Berlin, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110; also London, 62, 63.

¹²¹ Berlin, 103, 105; London, 61.

¹²² *JBL.*, XI., 120 sqq.

¹²³ *JA.*, XVII., 349.

¹²⁴ Berlin, 39.

made the *ameluti* *Yaudu* precursors of the men of Judah, *Yaudu* being more nearly an equivalent of *Yehud*.¹²⁵ But the most audacious combinations and the most amazing confidence have been developed by Major Conder.¹²⁶ According to him the Hebrews first appear in monumental history in Amarna letters written about 1480 B. C. The exodus has already taken place. It is the era of Israelitish conquest of Palestine. The *Habiri* are the Hebrews. The names of Joshua's great opponents, Japhia, Jabin, and Adonizedek, appear on the tablets. This is sufficiently startling. How were these discoveries made? The name of the king of Jerusalem is rendered *Abdihiba* by Winckler, *Aradhiba* by Halévy,¹²⁷ *Abdiheba* by Zimmern,¹²⁸ *Abdu dhabba* or *Ebedtob* by Sayce.¹²⁹ *Abdu* is, of course, the equivalent of *Arad*, meaning servant. As to *Hiba*, it may be read *Taba* in some instances, but, as Conder correctly sees, not in letter 102 Berlin, where it must be *Hiba*. But, says Conder, "*Abdihiba* is an unusual name, which is unknown to history." On the other hand, the name of Joshua's contemporary is well known. It was *Adonizedek*. *Abdu* means servant and *Adoni*, lord; *Zedek* means righteousness, and *khi + ba* means "good do," whatever that is.¹³⁰ Hence Conder substitutes *Adonizedek* in his translation wherever the text has *Abdihiba*. In reality *Abdihiba* seems to designate the king of Jerusalem as the servant of *Ramman*, "the god of *Martu*,"¹³¹ as Boissier has shown.¹³² This interpretation accounts satisfactorily for both readings. The name of the governor of the city of *Khasur* is given by Budge-Bezold as *Abdi-kar-ši*.¹³³ There is some doubt about the last sign *ši*. Conder changes the whole complex into *Iebaenu*, and announces *Jabin* of *Hazor*, Josh. xi. 1, as the author of the letter.¹³⁴ There are three letters from *Yapakhi*, governor of the city of *Gezer*.¹³⁵ According to Josh. x. 33, the king of *Gezer* at the time of Joshua was *Horam*. But *Japhia* of *Lachish* is mentioned, Josh. x. 3, as an enemy of Israel. Conder therefore suggests that "the words *Gezer* and *Lachish* would not look unlike in the writing of the earlier Hebrew (about the Christian era), but it is not impossible that the two towns may have had the same king."¹³⁶ And thus *Yapakhi* of *Gezer* is identified with *Japhia* of *Lachish*. None of these identifications, except that of the *Habiri*, in my judgment, deserves serious consideration. Even that single instance does not seem to me to be beyond all doubt. The initial guttural is no valid objection, for both pointed and unpointed 'ayin are represented by cheth in Babylonian; nor the first vowel,

¹²⁵ *JBL.*, XII., 61sq., cf. Tiele, *l. c.*

¹²⁶ *The Tell Amarna Tablets*, London, 1893.

¹²⁷ *JA.*, XVIII., 517.

¹²⁸ *ZA.*, VI., 246, where he also admits the possible reading *Abditaba* in some places.

¹²⁹ *Records of the Past*, Vol. V., 66 (new series).

¹³⁰ *l. c.*, p. 139.

¹³¹ Cf. Hommel, *Geschichte*, 349, 373.

¹³² *Notes sur les lettres de Tell el-Amarna*, in *ZA.*, VII., 346.

¹³³ *Tell el Amarna Tablets*, No. 48, p. lxxv.; cf. Bezold, *Oriental Diplomacy*, London, 1893, p. 46.

¹³⁴ *l. c.*, p. 112.

¹³⁵ London, 49, 50, 51.

¹³⁶ *l. c.*, p. 137. This I do not understand. Does Conder advocate an error in the Hebrew text? Is it his idea that *Gezer* was changed into *Lachish*, or the reverse? In either case, what becomes of *Horam*?

for how the original gentilicium from the root עבר was pronounced and how nearly correctly it was vocalized in cuneiform script, we do not know; nor the fact that "the time of Amenhotep IV. is entirely too late for the first appearance of the Ibrim in Palestine,"¹³⁷ for it is nowhere implied that this was their first appearance; nor the idea that all Hebrews must have been snugly settled in Gošen at this time (about 1400), for there is nothing to prevent some of their tribes from having drifted away from their kindred. Nor am I better satisfied with the explanation of Halévy,¹³⁸ who regards them as Kaššites, for there is no evidence that Burnaburiyaš had any occasion for carrying out his threat to send troops against Amenhotep, should this monarch fail to punish the offenders at Akko, or that the Habiri were the messengers of the Babylonian king, Milkili at least representing himself as loyal to Amenhotep and the other writers never referring to them as Babylonians; or that of Sayce,¹³⁹ who explains them as "confederated tribes," for there is little evidence of any confederacy and the determinative *ki* accompanying the name in one place¹⁴⁰ makes it improbable that they merely passed as "allies." But I feel attracted by Jastrow's view connecting the Habiri and mare Milkili with the Ašerite clans Heber and Malkiel. And I can accept his explanation of Yaudu, without rejecting Winckler's¹⁴¹ view of Yaudi. Labawi = Levi is a more doubtful identification;¹⁴² but it is suggestive of Levi's presence that Tehutimes III. in the fifteenth century found a district named Šemana,¹⁴³ which Tomkins considers identical with Šimeon.¹⁴⁴ He also found Išpal = Joseph-el¹⁴⁵ and Yaqbal = Jacob-el.¹⁴⁶ Is it a mere chance that the important tribes so conspicuously absent in the Song of Debora, Jud. V. viz., Judah and Joseph, Levi and Simeon, are just the ones whose presence in Palestine long before the conquest, monumental history would thus allow us to trace? And that the families of Ašer, whose failure to participate in the war calls forth no word of blame or indignation, are also found in this company?¹⁴⁷ This is just what we would expect, if these tribes, whatever their relationship, never had shared the trials and religious experiences of the wilderness and the enthusiasm of the conquest, the memories of which so solemnly bound the partici-

¹³⁷ Jastrow, *JBL.*, XI., 118, 119. ¹³⁸ *JA.*, XVIII., 547. ¹³⁹ *Records of the Past*, Vol. V., 59.

¹⁴⁰ Berlin, 199.

¹⁴¹ *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I., 1893, 1sq. May not the ameluti Yaudi have come from יָאֻדִי? This thought which I expressed in June, 1894, *Immortality and the Hadad Statue*, *JBL.*, XIII., p. 13, was also suggested in July by Halévy, *Revue Sém.*, 1894, p. 215.

¹⁴² יָאֻדִי = priest cf. Min. ¹⁴³ לֹאֲנִי = priest. ¹⁴⁴ Mariette, *Karnak*, pl. 25, No. 18.

¹⁴⁵ *Records of the Past*, V., 44. ¹⁴⁶ *l. c.*, No. 78.

¹⁴⁷ *l. c.*, No. 102. That even a scholar who, in mastery of sources, breadth of view, and accuracy of critical judgment, seems to me of living historians *facile princeps*, recognizes the value of scientific conjecture, may be seen from Ed. Meyer's article on Yaḳob-El and Yoseph-El in *ZATW.*, VI., 1886, p. 1sq.

¹⁴⁷ Heber and Malkiel may have been the first Ašerite clans to enter Palestine, while the main body itself lived between Gaza and Egypt even in the time of Arsu.

pants together that it was treason not to come to the help of Yahweh. But a relationship, though more remote, is by no means excluded. For all, or some of them, may have been severed from their kindred in Egypt or on the Sinaitic peninsula, and cast upon Palestine with the wave that swept the Hyksos in that direction. As to the Habiri or Heberi, the situation after the death of Amenhotep IV. invites the supposition that they succeeded in taking Kirjath Arba, giving their name Heberun or Hebron, i. e., Habiri district, to this important place. When they were driven away by the Hittites or the Amorites, in the following period, the name may have dropped, only to be resumed after the Israelitish conquest, just as the name of Jerusalem gave place to Jebus for a time, to revive again after a few centuries.

While thus suggesting the presence of elements afterwards entering into the composition of the בני ישראל, the Amarna tablets furnish absolutely no proof that the Israelitish conquests took place in the time of Amenhotep IV. Rather is their testimony evidence against such an assumption. For by the light they throw upon Palestinian history an event of that character is seen to be an impossibility yet for a long time. The fourteenth century witnessed the Hittite ascendancy in Syria, scarcely broken by the expeditions of Ramessu II. (1347-1281). Then the maritime invasion from Asia Minor under Mer-en-Ptah (1281-1269), and possibly the pressure of Assyria,¹⁴⁸ crushed the strength of the Hittite. Arsu's expedition may mark a revival of spirits in Palestine. But the Amorites became too exhausted by the campaigns of Ramessu III. to be able to resist the Hebrew tribes that then, and not until then, attacked them on a larger scale.

Thus it is impossible to assert that the Aperiu were Hebrews, that Manetho used sources coeval with the events he recorded, that the Minaean inscriptions refer to the Hebrews, or that the Amarna tablets have anything to tell concerning them. If any of the later Hebrew accounts of the Exodus is supposed to be accurate history, it is impossible to find in any inscription that has come to us from Egypt, the Desert, or Palestine the slightest knowledge of them. But with the view of early Hebrew history which a critical study of the Biblical narratives themselves suggests, it is quite conceivable that the Aperiu were Hebrews, that Manetho's story contains a kernel of real information, that the Ibru Naharan were Hebrew clans, and that the Amarna correspondence has preserved the memory of tribes afterwards members of the Bene Yisrael who already in the century before the Exodus may have attempted to enter Palestine. As for the date of this Exodus, all these sources point to the time of Arsu as the most likely to have witnessed such an event.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Jastrow, *ZA.*, VII., 189q.

ON THE HEBREW ELEMENT IN SLAVO-JUDAEO-GERMAN.

By LEO WIENER,

Missouri State University, Columbia, Mo.

I. INTRODUCTION.

The languages of nearly all Mohammedan countries have been influenced in some way by the Arabic. Their alphabets are adaptations of the Arabic alphabet to the needs of the foreign phonology; their vocabulary has been enriched and their grammar has been tainted by Semitic influence. The Jews had not gained sufficient political or religious supremacy and never had been present in sufficiently large numbers to influence to any considerable degree the languages of the nations among whom they lived. They spoke the tongues of their Christian fellow-citizens, and when violently torn from their surroundings and carried in compact masses to other lands, preserved in exile the language of their inhospitable stepfatherland. When they were driven from Spain and settled on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean they brought with them the Spanish idiom, which under the name of Ladino is spoken even to-day by their descendants in Turkey and the Levant. In 1553 a translation of the Old Testament into Ladino was published in Ferrara; a large number of books have appeared since on all kinds of subjects mainly from the press in Vienna. Its thorough linguistic investigation will certainly repay the student of Romance philology.

The fate of the German language among the Jews who spoke it in Germany, Russia, Galicia, Roumania, has been a very peculiar one. It is evident from the remains of the Jewish minnesaenger Süßkind and from many documents that have come down to us that up to the 15th century the language of the German Jews in no way differed from the dialects of the localities where they lived.¹

In the 16th century the German becomes vitiated by an introduction of Hebrew words, and in the following centuries this taint has grown to such pro-

¹ In an article of the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* inscribed *Ein mit hebräischen Buchstaben niedergeschriebener deutscher Segen gegen die Bärmutter* by Alois Miller, the following is quoted from Gudemann: "Die Sprache des Gedichts, wie es uns vorliegt, ist im ganzen und grossen spät mittelhochdeutsch, doch enthält es meiner Ansicht nach auch althochdeutsche Reste und dürfte es wahrscheinlich viel älter sein, als nach jetziger Fassung und Niederschrift vermutet werden kann," and further: "Beachtenswert ist die eigentümliche Umschreibung des Deutschen, welche teilweise die hebräischen Vokale zu Hilfe nehmen muss. Die auch dem Laien erkennbare Korrektheit der Sprache und Schrift lässt eine genaue Bekanntschaft des Schreibers mit dem Deutschen voraussetzen."

portions as to call for special grammars. Buxtorf,¹ Wagenseil,² Pfeffer,³ have composed grammars of the Judaeo-German⁴ for the use of theological students.

In the present unsatisfactory state of the history of the Jews in Germany in the 15th and 16th centuries it is impossible to ascertain the exact causes that led to this vitiation of the German language. I hold with Güdemann⁵ that German Jews lived in Russia previous to the 16th century, and that in their insulation from German surroundings they modified the dialect they had brought with them,⁶ and as they were pre-eminently given to the study of the Talmud and the Bible, they, under these unfavorable conditions, made free use of words and expressions more familiar to them in the Hebrew form. Harkavy⁷ and still more Bershadski⁸ insist that the language of the Russian Jews previous to the Lublin Union was Slavic. The facts, however, seem to indicate a bilingualism long before that period.⁹

These Russian Jews became the teachers of the German Jewish youth.¹⁰ Thus only can be explained the presence of Slavic words in the Judaeo-German of Germany.

In Slavo-Judaeo-German, Hebrew influence appears in the use of the Hebrew alphabet, the introduction of a considerable number of Hebrew words and some grammatical forms. Before entering on the subject proper it is necessary to review the causes that led to the peculiar pronunciation of Hebrew by the Russian and Polish Jews.

¹ *Thesaurus grammaticus linguae Sanctae Hebraicae* (Basles, 1609), in the appendix to which is found the *Usus et Exercitatio lectionis Hebraeo-Germanicae*.

² J. Chr. Wagenseil's *Belehrung der Jüdisch Teutschen Red- und Schreibart*: etc..... Königsberg, gedruckt in dem Jahre, 1699. Heyl-Jahr.

³ *Manuductio facilis ad lectionem talmudico-rabbinicam*, Sectio I: *De lectione Ebraeo-germanica*, in his *Critica Sacra*, 1680.

⁴ Cf. Avé-Lallemant, *Das deutsche Gaunerthum*, Vol. III., pp. 218-240, also Lazăr Saineanu, *Studiu Dialectologic asupra Graiului Evreo-German*, Bucuresti, 1889, pp. 17-29.

⁵ M. Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland während des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts*, p. 296.

⁶ An investigation in the dialects of Southwest Germany, on which I am now working, leads me to the conclusion that the various dialects of Slavo-Judaeo-German have their origin in Hesse-Darmstadt, Aschaffenburg and Unterfranken, i. e., in the neighborhood of Frankfort on the Main. Heinrich Heine had surmised as much in the case of Mäuselddeutsch.

⁷ A. Harkavy, *שפת היהודים והסלאוים*, Wilno, 1876. There is also a Russian translation of the work.

⁸ S. A. Bershadski, *Litovskije Jewret*, St. Petersburg, 1883.

⁹ So, too, German Jews, in the East at least, were acquainted with Slavic, to judge from a note in Steinschneider's *Hebräische Bibliographie*, XI. Jahrgang, p. 57: "Nota quod iudei in omnibus partibus non habent idem ydionia commune quia in alemannia aliud habent ydionia commune eis et est slavicum nam audivi indeum emere et vendere cum slavo in alemannia scilicet in partibus meis. Diese worte citirt Boncompagni (*Atti dell'Accademia Pontif.* XVI., 1863, S. 692, 721) aus dem handschriftlichen Werke des Johannes Alemanus de "pulcro rivo" [wahrscheinlich Schönbach in der Lausitz], welcher 1297-8 in Paris war (*Atti*, S. 740), bekannter unter dem Namen Johannes de Saxonia als Verf. von "Canones" über die Alphonsinischen Tabellen.

¹⁰ Cf. Güdemann, *ibid.*, pp. 295, 296.

II. PRONUNCIATION OF HEBREW.

More or less confused ideas were held even by prominent grammarians, such as Luzzatto, Gesenius, as to the correct pronunciation of Hebrew and the causes of a different pronunciation by German and Polish Jews. Some held that it was a Syriac mode of pronouncing Hebrew, others that it was a corrupt Sephardic form. Martin Schreiner¹ is the first one to prove the absurdity of either statement and to place the question on a truly scientific basis. The following words² clearly state his position: Die Aussprache des Hebräischen konnte sich unter semitischen Völkern natürlich nicht in solchem Maasse verändern und von der ursprünglichen entfernen, wie bei den in den europäischen Ländern wohnenden Juden. Anfangs mag die Aussprache der europäischen Juden nur wenig verschieden gewesen sein von derjenigen der in den Ländern des Islâms lebenden, aber in dem Maasse, in welchem die in Europa wohnenden die Sprache ihres Aufenthaltes sich aneigneten, wurde ihr Sinn für die Eigenthümlichkeiten der semitischen Laute getrübt; und so sehen wir die Aussprache sich immer mehr und mehr verändern. . . . Und wenn sich schon in der Aussprache der arabischen Juden fremder Einfluss bemerkbar macht, der sie aber—und hier meinen wir diejenigen von Jemen—nicht sehr von der ursprünglichen Aussprache entfernt, so können wir in der sogenannten deutschpolnischen Aussprache, welche aber auch viele Wandlungen aufweist, nur einen Product indo-germanischen Einflusses erblicken.

But this is not all. *Not only is the pronunciation of Hebrew by the Polish Jews due to the influence of the spoken German language, but it has kept pace with the deterioration of German into Judaeo-German.* Saineanu³ grasps this fact but does not arrive at any general conclusion, nor are his statements complete.

The Hebrew consonants have their German values. א and ו are toneless, since the spiritus lenis and spiritus asper do not play any part in German itself. We will see later, however, that tradition keeps up א as a spiritus lenis in transliterations up to our times. In יעקב *Jajnkew* the ו has become nasalized, either on account of a long *a* preceding the ו, or, more probably, on account of its resemblance to the Slavic name *Janko*.

ה and ח are respectively *h* and *ch*. These sounds were confused as early as the time of Hieronymos, and they are pronounced alike by the nations who do not distinguish between the two sounds, as for example, by the Greek Jews.⁴

י and ו as consonants are *j* and *w*.

¹ *Zur Geschichte der Aussprache des Hebräischen.* Von Martin Schreiner, in Budapest. ZATW., Bd. VI.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 258, 259.

³ Lazăr Saineanu, *Studiu*, etc., pp. 54-55.

⁴ The German Jews were divided in the time of Isserlein (15th century) into Hetites and Chetites, those who pronounced ח like German *h* or *ch*. Cf. Güdemann, *ibid.*, pp. 75 sqq.

ל, מ, נ, ר are exactly as in German. Of the twofold value of ר, as with the Arabian Jews, nothing is known.

ב and פ have, perhaps, retained their original values and are G. *b* and *p* respectively. ו and פ = G. *w* and *f*, instead of the older *bh* and *ph*, from which, naturally, *w* and *f* would be developed.

ג = G. *g*. Dāghēš does not change its pronunciation. German has only one *k* sound, hence both כ and ק are alike *k*.¹ ח = G. *ch* evidently evolved from *kh*. In S.-J.-G. this *ch*, as well as ך, is very guttural.

ד is G. *d* and Dāghēš does not change it. ט and ת must naturally become alike and = G. *t*, while ת originally *th*, becomes *s*. This will not surprise, when we consider that Germans invariably render English *th* by *s*, and that the sound of Castillian *c* and *z* is pure *s* in the New World.

In most countries there is no difference in the pronunciation of ס and ש; so also in Germany there was originally no difference and both sounded *s*. In Germany *sch* is generally a development of *s*, and so ש differentiated into ש = *s* and ש = *sch*. In the early transliterations of the Bible with Greek characters בראשית is rendered βρεσσιθ. ז is G. soft *s* and צ = G. *z*.

The vowels have undergone a much more thorough change since the vowels of S.-J.-G. have experienced great mutations. B. H. Levensohn in his יסרון ספר תלמוד לשון עברי לאדם mixes truth with fiction in attempting to explain these peculiar changes.²

Hebrew accent is generally disregarded, and in S.-J.-G. it is placed on the penult. In many words, however, the original accent prevails, as in אלהים *elohim* God. In reading pointed texts the vowels generally receive their full value; in reading unpointed books Russian Jews (wherever this denomination

¹ Cf. Gudemann, *Ibid.*, pp. 77.

² Cf. pp. 19 sqq. of the Wilno edition of 1874. The following synopsis in English I owe to the kindness of Dr. I. M. Casanowicz, of Washington, D. C.:

Hebrew, like all original and pure languages, had the five sounds or vowels, *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, which are divided in long or open ones, and short or closed ones. When the present vowel points were introduced, the signs for the long sounds were made different from those for the short ones in name and shape. Only the *i* sound (hîrêq) was given one sign for both, as the long *i* is sufficiently distinguished from the short one by its being followed by 'quiescens. Long *a* (qāmêq) was distinguished from the short one (pāthāh) by making the horizontal stroke somewhat broader. While thus the signs for the long and short vowels were different in name and form, and the sounds themselves differed in quantity, the quality of both, the long and the short sounds were the same. This is still the pronunciation of the Portuguese Jews and those who follow them. Not so with the German Jews and their followers in Poland, etc. They distinguish between the long and short vowels not only concerning the quantity but also the quality of sound. Thus with the Qêrê (ê) they let hear something of the hîrêq (î). They were influenced by the circumstance that qêrê and hîrêq are both palatal sounds, and by the people surrounding them, namely the Germans who also have the compound sound *ei*. With the hōlēm (ô) they sound somewhat of the šûrêq (û). Here, too, both sounds are labials, and the German *ou* offered itself for imitation. Hîrêq and šûrêq they left unaltered since the following ' and ı resp., which are heard in the sounding of these vowels sufficiently distinguish the long from the short ones. Etc., etc.

I also take this occasion to thank Dr. Pietsch, of the Newberry Library of Chicago, for directing my attention to some valuable material incorporated in this essay.

occurs in the essay, Polish, Galician, Roumanian Jews as well are meant) modify the unaccented syllables as in S.-J.-G. proper. A number of accented syllables change their vowel sounds, partly in consequence of certain phonetic laws, partly because they became acquainted with these words through unpointed books where the exact pronunciation could not be ascertained. In the following examples most of the words have become naturalized in S.-J.-G. and the pronunciation is that of the Lithuanian Jews, unless otherwise stated. The letters in transliteration have their German values, and z = G. soft s , z = French j .

German \bar{a} has in most dialects developed into \bar{o} , in S.-J.-G. under Slavic influence into \bar{o} ; German \check{a} and \check{o} remain \check{a} and \check{o} respectively. Hence $\text{p}\check{\text{a}}\text{th}\check{\text{a}}\text{h}$ is pronounced \check{a} , $\text{q}\check{\text{a}}\text{m}\check{\text{e}}\check{\text{c}}$ and $\text{q}\check{\text{a}}\text{m}\check{\text{e}}\check{\text{c}}$ $\text{h}\check{\text{a}}\text{t}\check{\text{a}}\text{p}\text{h}$ are both \check{o} .¹ $\text{b}\bar{\text{a}}\text{r}$ $\text{pl}\check{\text{ü}}\text{g}\text{t}\bar{\text{e}}$ opponent, $\text{k}\bar{\text{o}}\check{\text{j}}\text{a}\text{ch}$ strength; $\text{ch}\bar{\text{o}}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}\text{m}\bar{\text{e}}$ wisdom, $\text{l}\bar{\text{e}}\text{w}\bar{\text{o}}\text{n}\bar{\text{e}}$ moon, $\text{m}\bar{\text{e}}\text{l}\bar{\text{o}}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}\bar{\text{e}}$ work.

In the South and in Poland this \bar{o} has further developed into a dull u ,² hence the last two words would sound there $\text{l}\bar{\text{e}}\text{w}\bar{\text{u}}\text{n}\bar{\text{e}}$, $\text{m}\bar{\text{e}}\text{l}\bar{\text{u}}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}\bar{\text{e}}$.

Two \check{a} following each other in the same syllable become \check{a} (through original \bar{a}) if no other syllable follows, otherwise \bar{a} in Poland, $\bar{a}j$ in Lithuania and even \bar{a} (an nasalized) in Bessarabia and Roumania.³ $\text{b}\bar{\text{a}}\text{l}$ $\text{m}\bar{\text{e}}\text{l}\bar{\text{o}}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}\bar{\text{e}}$ artisan, $\text{r}\bar{\text{a}}\text{sch}$ tumult, noise, $\text{k}\bar{\text{a}}\text{s}$ anger; $\text{g}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$ (in Poland $\text{g}\bar{\text{a}}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$, in Roumania $\text{g}\bar{\text{a}}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$) pride, $\text{t}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$, ($\text{t}\bar{\text{a}}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$, $\text{t}\bar{\text{a}}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$) passion, $\text{d}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$ (for bibl. $\text{d}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$) ($\text{d}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$, $\text{d}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}$) trouble, care.

Oo is rare and becomes \check{o} , $\text{s}\check{\text{c}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{o}}$ (nh.) $\text{s}\check{\text{c}}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{u}}$ in the South) hour. More generally the contraction does not take place, $\text{h}\bar{\text{a}}\text{n}\bar{\text{o}}\bar{\text{e}}$ (nh.) enjoyment, $\text{h}\bar{\text{a}}\text{s}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\text{o}}\bar{\text{e}}$ (nh.) warning.

If \bar{a} is followed by h the second \bar{a} disappears. $\text{m}\bar{\text{a}}\text{ch}\bar{\text{n}}\bar{\text{e}}$ host, $\text{a}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}\bar{\text{r}}\bar{\text{a}}\text{j}\bar{\text{e}}$ risk.

In a large number of words $\text{q}\check{\text{a}}\text{m}\check{\text{e}}\check{\text{c}}$ is pronounced like \check{a} , probably because of the word appearing more frequently in the construct or other grammatical form, where $\text{p}\check{\text{a}}\text{th}\check{\text{a}}\text{h}$ takes the place of the $\text{q}\check{\text{a}}\text{m}\check{\text{e}}\check{\text{c}}$. $\text{b}\bar{\text{i}}\text{n}\bar{\text{j}}\bar{\text{e}}$ (nh.) $\text{b}\bar{\text{i}}\text{n}\bar{\text{j}}\bar{\text{e}}$ aw axiom $\text{t}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m}$ (cf. $\text{t}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m}$, $\text{t}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m}$) simple, $\text{e}\check{\text{j}}\text{s}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}\bar{\text{e}}$ $\text{a}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}$ sister-in-law, $\text{d}\bar{\text{a}}\text{n}$ (nh.) $\text{d}\bar{\text{a}}\text{n}$ $\text{l}\bar{\text{e}}\text{k}\bar{\text{a}}\text{f}$ $\text{z}\bar{\text{c}}\text{h}\bar{\text{u}}$ to take the best view of a person, $\text{m}\bar{\text{a}}\text{n}$ manna, $\text{c}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m}$ (nh.) $\text{c}\bar{\text{h}}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m}$ $\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}\text{j}\bar{\text{o}}\text{w}\bar{\text{e}}\text{s}\check{\text{c}}\text{h}$ warm and dry, $\text{s}\bar{\text{a}}\text{d}\bar{\text{i}}\text{n}$ sheet,

¹ The examples are mainly from Levensohn's notes, as above, pp. 19sq.; nh. stands for neohebraic.

² This I take to be Slavic influence. Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Slavischen Sprachen*, Vol. I., p. 430, has the following: unbetontes \bar{o} lautet in vielen gegenden klr. wie u : kutróhu d. i. kotróho . Dieselbe regel gilt für das bulg. und das rumun.; wr. dagegen lautet unbetontes \bar{o} nach der r. regel wie aaltes \bar{o} wird unter bestimmten bedingungen, unter denen es ehemals lang war, im N. und im S. durch u , ou ersetzt an dessen stelle in der mittleren region i tritt, das ich durch \bar{o} bezeichne: \bar{o} , u , uo , \bar{o} ; vujsko neben vójsko nd.

In Poland $\bar{o} = u$. In precisely these localities does German and Hebrew \bar{o} (from \bar{a}) become u ; in Poland it sounds like ue .

³ In the same localities German $ei = a$, as in $wa = \text{wein}$, wine.

מִתִּיר דָּם (cf. נָקִי) *másir dām* he who bleeds, כָּתַב (nh.) *ksaw* scriptum, נָע וָנָד (nh.) *nawenád* wandering, vagrant, מֵאֵשׁ (nh.) *mejásesch* despairing, תָּנַן (nh.) *tenán* we learn, חַתָּנִים *chasánim* bridegrooms, כָּלָל (nh.) *klal* general, rule, פָּרַט (nh.) *frat* special, הִוִּיתָ (nh.) *hawójes* discussions. This is generally the case before *ch*, מַלְאָךְ *málach* angel. מִזְרַח *mígrach* Orient, East, סָךְ *sach* a great deal, much.

Ĉērê = ě (*ej*), but *aj* in Poland,¹ S^ghōl = ě, Š^wâ = unaccented German *e*. בַּעַל עֵבֶרָה *balawéjre* sinner, חֵן *chejn* grace, תֵּבָה *téjwe* ark; נֶפֶשׁ *néfesch* soul; לִכְבוֹד *lekówed* in honor of, מְלִמֵּד *melámed* teacher.

In closed syllables and in a few others ĉērê is pronounced like ě. אֱלִיהוּ *elijóhu* Elijah, וְאָם אָב *ow weém* father and mother, בֵּית דִּין (nh.) *besdín* judicial court, גֵּר *ger* stranger, הַגֵּז רֵאשִׁית *réjschis hagé* the first offering of the shearing, גֵּט (nh.) *get* divorce, יָשָׁר (nh.) *sched* evil spirit, לֵץ *lez* (bibl. scorner, scoffer) ghost, goblin, נֵר תְּמִיד *nertómíd* the lamp before the ark of the scrolls, עַל חֲטָא *alchéť* litany in the ritual of Atonement day.

In open accented syllables s^ghōl generally becomes *ej* (ě). מֶלֶךְ *méjlech* king, פֶּסַח *péjsach* Passover, צֶלֶם *zéjlem* cross, חֶדֶר *chéjder* school, קֶבֶר *kéjwer* grave, פֶּגֶר *péjger* carcass, שְׂקִץ *schéjgez* urchin, כֶּפֶל *kéjfel* multiply.

Š^wâ, whether quiescens or mobile, is silent wherever the consonants form a group easy of enunciation to Slavic or German, or when the consonants belong to two separate syllables. Haťûph has no effect on the vowel. בִּשְׁלֹמָה (nh.) *bischlôme* granted, גּוּל גְּבוּל *gwul* border, דְּוֹקָא (nh.) *dáwke* by all means, וְתֵרֵן (nh.) *wátren* liberal giver, סְחֹרָה *s-chôjre* goods. But when š^wâ is an evident development of a vowel in a word already in use in S.-J.-G. the original vowel is sounded, as in גְּנֵבָה (from גָּנֵב *gánew* thief) *ganéjwe* what is stolen.

Hîrêq is *i* except before ר when it may sound *e* as in words of German origin. בְּרִיָּה (nh.) *bérje* a thorough workman, תִּירוּץ (nh.) *térez* reason.

German *ō* has developed a large number of sounds in Judæo-German. German Jews pronounce it *ou* or *au*; the Polish and Southern Jews pronounce it *aj*; in Lithuania it gets the umlaut and sounds *ōj*, which in many localities is flattened and sounds *ej*. Accordingly hōlēm has undergone the same changes. תּוֹרָה *tóure*, *tójre*, *tójre*, *téjre* Holy Writ, מִכָּח *mikójach* in regard to, טוֹבָה *tójwe* kindness.

In closed syllables, however, *ō* has changed to *ö*. מוֹל טוֹב *mázeltow* good luck, יוֹם טוֹב *jóntew* holiday, יוֹרְשִׁים *jórschim* heirs, שׁוֹפְטִים *schóftim* judges, שׁוֹנִים *sonim* enemies, תּוֹלְדוֹת *tóldes* history, רוֹצְחִים *rózchim* murderers, אֲפִיקוֹרְסִים (nh.) *apikórsim* heretics, קוֹל *kol* voice, דּוֹר *dor* generation, סוֹף *sof* end.

¹ So, too, *geh'*, *schnee* sounds in the Polish dialect *gaj*, *schnaj*.

In Poland and the South *u* through the umlaut has become *i*, hence šūrěq and qībūḇ sound there *i*. גִּילֵה *gāile* joy, מְשֻׁמֵּד (nh.) *meschimēd* apostate. In Lithuania both remain *u*. רוּחַ *ruach* devil, רִשְׁוֹת (nh.) *reschūs* permission, possession.

Unaccented posttonic syllables (except ים and ה) invariably change their vowels to *e*. רופא *rójfe* physician, ממזר *mámzer* bastard, סופר *sójfer* scribe; תורה *tójre* Holy Writ, שמחה *simche* joy, מנחה (nh.) *minche* evening prayer; צדקות *zdókes* and *zdókes* alms, יום כפור (nh.) *jonkíper* Atonement day. But רוח *ruach* devil, גזלנים (nh.) *gazlónim* robbers. So also ה in compound words becomes toneless *e*. בעל הבית *balebós* master of the house, or is entirely neglected as in המדרש בית *besmédresch* synagogue.

III. TRANSLITERATION.

The Jews of nearly all civilized countries in the Middle Ages wrote the languages of their Christian fellow citizens with Hebrew characters. The oldest documents so far investigated reach back into the thirteenth century.¹ A system of transliteration, fairly uniform for all countries, had been established before this time, and I shall attempt the proof that the German way, and with it the S. J.-G. way, of transliteration is a direct development of the French, Provençal and Spanish mode of writing with Hebrew characters.

All agree that the Jews tried not only approximately but even exactly to render the pronunciation of the European idioms.² Originally only three letters were used to represent all possible vowel sounds, namely א, י, ו. In Ladino,³ where the number of vowels is smallest, א represents *a*, י stands for *e* and *i*, ו

¹ Ein mit hebräischen Buchstaben niedergeschriebener deutscher Segen gegen die Blutmutter by Alois Miller, Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Litteratur, No. 19, cf. above.

Histoire littéraire de la France, Vol. XXVII., pp. 439 and 440, Jehouda ben Éléazar; p. 442, Un autre élève d'Élyaqim; p. 540 Menahem se sert de mots provençaux ou plutôt catalans; extrait des gloses du Manuscrit de Paris 207; extrait des gloses du manuscrit de Parme 582; extrait des gloses du manuscrit Halberstam.

Deux Élégies du Vatican, Arsène Darmstetter, Romania, 3, pp. 443 sqq.

Les Roman Provençal d'Esther par Cresca Du Caylar, Médecin Juif du XIV^e siècle. Neubauer & Meyer, Romania 21 (1892), pp. 194-227.

De Vocabulis Francogallicis Judaice transcriptis, disseruit Eduardus Boehmer, Romanische Studien, I., pp. 197 sqq.

Der Vocalbuchstabe y von M. St. (Steinschneider), Hebräische Bibliographie, VI., p. 119.

² Cf. p. —. Ein mit hebräischen Buchstaben, etc.

Deux Élégies du Vatican: Ce qui importe, c'est de savoir que l'écrivain juif avait le sentiment d'une différence de prononciation entre les diverses sifflantes.

Güdemann, Geschichte, etc. as above, p. 292: Aus der vorstehenden Uebersicht ergibt sich, dass die jüdisch-deutsche Orthographie der deutschen angepasst und dass sie kunstvoll und planmässig angelegt ist. Wenn Steinschneider (Serapeum 1864, S. 129) von einer Handschrift des Sittenbuches sagt: "Die Orthographie ist auch hier eine sehr schwankende," so kann man dasselbe Urtheil über die Orthographie jedes deutschen Buches aus dieser Zeit fällen.....Dieser Verwilderung gegenüber stellt man der jüdisch-deutschen Orthographie ein sehr ehrendes Zeugniß aus, wenn man sie bloss "schwankend" nennt.

³ The only book I have been able to consult on Ladino is a prayer book published in Vienna about 30 years ago; in the main the spelling has not been changed in the last 400 years.

for *o* and *u*; for final *a* א is used. א also represents the spiritus lenis, hence words beginning with י and ך are preceded by א; it is also placed between ך and י in the middle of the word to indicate that the two vowels are to be pronounced separately.

בִּנְדִּיגֹו טו ה' נואיסטרו דייו ר"י די איל מונדרו קי מוס סאנטיפיקו אין מוס אינקומינדאנסאם אי מוס אינקומינדרו סוברי לאבאדורה די מאנוס. Bendijo tu nuestro Deio rei de el mundo qui mos santificó en sus encomendanzas é mos encomendó sobre lavadura de manos.

The same is the case in Catalan.¹ אדרציאטץ adreztatz, נובליאזש noblezas, גולונדרינו golondrino, פאשארו passaro, אישטורבט estorbet, אדורנאמינט adornament, אריסמנט adrement, אישטורבט estorbet.

In the other Provençal dialects² even *a* may be left out, especially when the text is pointed. *U* after a vowel is rendered by ב; ״, as might be expected, stands for *ei*. לאור laor, מוטה mota, פרוור provar, מודט mudat, קפיו capio, איניגא אנגראם e vinga (pour vinha) angres, שײאין דשרדיגאטש sien desradigatz, אינטוטה מנבדידה en tota ma gaudida.

In *Deux Élégies du Vatican*, אה occurs for final *a*. Atonic *e* is sometimes represented by א; *u* after a vowel is rendered as before by ב, or by וו, or וב.

גְּשׁוּי כהן איאופרנדא דמון קורש ויש אופרי

Je sui Cohen, e ofrande de mon cors vos ofrir.

In the *Langue d'Oïl*³ א quite frequently expresses atonic *e* and silent *e*, either because *e* was felt only as a spiritus lenis or because in the case of the posttonic *a* it generally represents a Romance *a*. ך stands for *u* (*ü*) as well as *o*. Open and closed vowels are not distinguished. The following combinations are given by Boehmer as possible. Ex modo allatis vocalium simplicium signis notae pendent combinationum :

וו	וי	וא	יו	יי	יא	או	אי	אא
(u)				(i)		(o)	(e)	
uu	ui	ua	iu	ii	ia	au	ai	aa
uo	ue	ue	io	ie	ie	ao	ae	ae
ou	oi	oa	eu	ei	ea	eu	ei	ea
oo	oe	oe	eo	ee	ee	ee	eo	ee

The examples cited are from *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXVII., p. 439 : פּרפּנציר porpencer, בואיר vouer, אי דיפייזנט e defeseient, אייגלא aigle, קורביל corbel, אשפרויר esprevier ou esparvier, שליב דנון salv de non, שונברייט son brés, פרץ אלונייר feraz, alonger (ou alognier).

¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, as above.

² *Ibid.*, and *Deux Élégies du Vatican*, as above. *Roman Provençal d'Esther*, as above.

³ *De Vocabulis Francogallicis*, as above; *Histoire littéraire*, as above.

German transliteration follows the same rules. Anciently א was used for *a* and posttonic (final) *e*; ם is *e* and *i*; ן stands for *o* and *u*. In *Ein mit hebräischen Buchstaben niedergeschriebener deutscher Segen* א is not used as a spiritus lenis. לִגְדִּיך leg dich, בּוֹכָא buche, לִגֵּן legen, רַחֲטָה rechte, וִיש visch, מִינְשְׁלִיכֵש menschlichs, דְּרִיא drie, יִנְשְׁטִיט instet, וִילִיוֹש wilius. In the Judaeo-German glosses of R. Moses Haddarschan of the 13th century,¹ the vowels have the same values and א occurs as a spiritus lenis. In a few cases in both manuscripts does ע appear as an accented *e*. What led to the introduction is hard to ascertain. Its use did not become universal before the 16th century.²

Isserlein (d. 1460) gives in his appendix to the "Sittenbuch" a number of rules for writing German with Hebrew characters. Güdemann discusses them in note VII. of his *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland während des XIV. u. XV. Jahrhunderts*, but generally fails to grasp the reason for the use of certain combinations.

1. "Erstlichen is zu wissen dz ein Jud bringt ein Chirek un' ein Zere."

Güdemann sees in this a proof of the antiquity of Hebrew transliteration, because Gothic *i* becomes German *e*, etc. In reality this is taken bodily from the Romance languages where *y* had to do service for *e* and *i*.

2. "Un ein Alef bringt ein Kamez un' ein Patach."

For example וואהנהאפטִיג = wohnhaftig. Since long *a* became *ø*, א naturally followed the same mutation. This innovation did not take root till the next century.

3. "Un ein Waw bringt ein Melo-pum (Schurek) un ein Cholem." This is again Romance usage.

4. "Un ein Ayin bringt ein Segol."

5. "Un wenn zwai Juden sein so is die letter die dar vor stet al mol gepüntelt (gepüntelt, vacalisirt, dh. man hat sich dieselbe vocalisirt zu denken) mit einem Patach un' dz Jud mit einem Schwa un' dz ander Jud macht ein zeichen dz es kein Chirek is gleich als אִיין = ain, צווייא = zwai דְּרִיא, un' das fehlt gar selten."

Güdemann sees in it again a proof that the Jews transliterated German with Hebrew characters at a time when *weib* was written *wip*. (Hier haben wir also abermals einen Rest des altdeutschen Jüdischdeutsch. Güd.). As in Old French, *ei* is merely rendered by ם, and when *ei* was pronounced *ai*, ם still remained to express this sound.

6. "Un' ein Alef so es hinden stet nach einem Püntel so tut es niks denn es macht der Geschrift ein Zirunge gleich als דִּיא = di (die)."

¹ *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien* von Dr. Joseph Perles, München, 1884.

² Cf. Der Vocalbuchstabe ן von M. St., *Hebräische Bibliographie*, VI., p. 119.

י is *i* and with the older writers atonic *e*; ך is *u*. ם stands for *e* ($\bar{e}j = e\bar{i}$) and *aj*, ן for *ou*, *oj*, $\bar{o}j$ and *ej* according to the dialect. This might have been expected since these sounds are developments of *au* and \bar{o} (or *o*). When *oj* stands for *o* the older writers employed ן alone. Some Southern authors write ם for *oj*. In the South ם sounds also as *u*, when this is a development of *o*, and ן like *i*.

The orthography in vogue with the best writers of the day in Russia is a compromise between phonetic spelling and German writing and attempts to render the words in such a way that Polish, Lithuanian and Southern Jews may readily recognize it. In the most excellent collection of S.-J.-G. literary productions "Di Jidische Folksbibliothek," Mr. Rabinowitsch puts down the following rules:

1. Me darf schrajben jidesch, azöj wi me ret.
2. Me darf schrajben azöj, az saj der pöjlischer leger, saj der litwak golen konen ferschtejn.
3. Jeder Żargonist darf gedenken az er schrajbt żargón, d. h. mer farn folk, farn חמון עם.
4. Dos ouslejen fun di dajtsche werter darfen gajn mer nohent zu dajtsch.
5. Es darf gajn חילוק zwischen werter was weren glajch ousgeret un hoben zweyerlej bedajtung, למשל: שטיין-stein un שטעהן-stehn; צעהן-zehn un צאהן-Zähne; זייער-zejer (ihr) un זעהר-sehr; ווייניג-un wenig un וועניג-wenig (if the latter word were written in accordance with its pronunciation it would be written ווייניג, and would thus only differ in the vowel points); ציילען-zahlen (Zeilen, Reihen) un צעהלען-zählen; איר-ir (Sie) un איהר-ih; זון-Sonne, זון-Sohn un זין-Sinn (the first two sound *zun* in Lithuania, but all three are pronounced *gin* in the South. פֿיער vier un פֿיהר אִךְ ich führe; אן daran (an dem) un אהן אִךְ ohne dem; פיעל viel un פיהל אִךְ ich fühle.

If to this will be added that Hebrew words are spelled as in Hebrew, the chaotic state of spelling in S.-J.-G. becomes evident. It is to be hoped that some authoritative writer, such as Abramowitsch, will introduce a more sensible and simple spelling reform or at least revert to the older, less objectionable, spelling of the last century. For one not versed in S.-J.-G. it becomes an impossibility even to guess at the probable sound of a written word. The vowel points occur only in some books printed not with rabbinical type and are somewhat of an aid since pāthāth = *a*, qāmēç = *ō*, s'ghôl = *e*, çêrê = *ej*, šûrēq = *u*, hîrēq = *i*, š'wâ is always silent.

Consonantal transformations differentiate more readily in the different languages than vowel changes, hence there is a greater tendency to develop independently. Yet, on the whole, it can be easily shown that German transliteration of consonants has developed directly from the Romance. I suspect that Ladino of to-day has introduced some changes, especially in rendering Spanish *s*, that were not common in the Middle Ages, and Ladino is introduced here only for completeness' sake.

In Ladino ב and פ are *b* and *p* respectively; the same with raphe, פ, פ are *v* and *f*, ב and ק are *g*, *k* (*c*, *qu*); ג is *j* (*g*); כ is not used. ד and ט (ת is not used) express *d* and *t*. ך stands for *s* or *z* between vowels; this is due to the fact that anciently such *s* or *z* was pronounced softly like English *z*; ך answers Spanish *s* and *ç*. ל, מ, נ, ר are *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*; I believe ך occurs for *ñ*. י as a consonant is = *y*. Compare examples as above.¹

In Catalan the same letters hold; but ש much more frequently than ך stands for *s*, both ך and ש corresponds to *z*, perhaps with a different pronunciation.

The same is still true of Provençal Proper. כ = Pr. *ch*; ך = ך = soft *s*; ג = Pr. *nh*; ג = Pr. *j*; ו = Pr. *v*; ש = *s*; ש = *ç*.

פֿריקוואַרשׁ ווײַנר׳ יצחק כהן רֿקֿריר
קֿינאַ טורנ׳ט וויר לור קֿריאַצאַ אַוואַלי קוֹנֿר׳ט פֿריר
אִיריט קאַבײַשׁ טנט נֶאָוֿל פֿור גַי מוֹריר .

Préchors vínret R. Içhak Cohen rekerir

K'i se tornat ver lor creace o il li kevanret perir

I dit: Ke avés tant? Je vol por Gé morir.

In the Langue d'Oïl the consonants are the same as in Provençal, but, of course, ג does not occur; rarely כ stands for ש = *s*.

To express the guttural sound *ch* in German, Jews very early began to use כ but never ח. *S* and *sch* are both written ש; in French *ch* is generally a development of *k*, hence it was natural to write it with כ; similarly in German *sch* is usually a development of *s*, hence ש had to do service for both. *W* is rendered by ו as in Romance, and *v* by ן or ב. In all other respects there is no difference between Romance and German usage. We saw כ creeping in in Romance in place of ש; in Judaeo-German it has finally come to entirely replace ש.

There is no material difference between consonantism of Judaeo-German and Slavo-Judaeo-German. ו and never ב is used for *w*, hence only one letter occurs with raphe, namely פ for *f*; in printed books פ stands more generally for *p* and פ for *f*. The Slavic sound *z* is written זש, and the semi-vowel *ž*, or consonant *y* (G. *j*), is expressed by י.

To illustrate Slavo-Judaeo-German spelling a few examples are subjoined.

עשׁ וואר דער מיט דיא שטאט אויף. אַלטע לייט זאגן ראשׁ מען
האט דארטן איין גרייזט דעם דאמאוואי און וועלן אלזו שוין גיט
בלייבן רוהיג ביז מען וועט ראשׁ הווי אין גאַנצן אפּ ברעכין.

Es war dermit di schtot ouf. Alte lajt zogen dos men hot dorten ajn gerejzt
dem domowój un welen alzöj schöjn nit blajben rúig big men wet dos houg in
ganzen op brechen.

¹ Since writing this, the following essay has appeared: R. Foulché-Delbosc, *La transcription hispano-hébraïque* in the *Revue Hispanique*, Numéro I., Mars 1894.

Of course, the orthography is here inconsistent, but it is evident that in the main Mr. Dick (a writer of novels in the Lithuanian dialect of S.-J.-G.) is following the older form of the Middle Ages. Another author, J. M. Lipschitz, writing in the Southern dialect, introduces a few consistent changes, namely: א' for *oj*, ע' for *ej*, א for *u* = original *o*), but does not himself carry out his own rules:

מיינט ניט אז דיא יודישע שפראך איז ארימער פֿין דער העברע
ישטר, ווייל דער דאזיקער חלק ווערטערבײ איז אפֿשר צי קליין פֿאר
אייד.

Mejnt nit az di jidische schprach iz urimer fin der hebrejischer, wajl der doziker chejlek werterbich iz efscher zi klejn far ajeh.

Final א after vowels is now generally discarded by Jargonists, as in Abramowitsch's translation of the psalm:

עס וויגט די ערד זיך, שטורעמט אונטען
עס ציטערן פון בערג די גרונטען.
קראך! קראך! אט וואלען זיי זיך איין
ווי באלד ער קומט אין בעס אריין.

Es wigt di erd zich, schturemt unten
Es zitern fun berg di grunten.
Krach! Krach! Ot walen gej zich ajn
Wi bald er kumt in kas arajn.

NOTES ON SEMITIC GRAMMAR.

By DR. MAX L. MARGOLIS,

Assistant Professor of Hebrew and Syriac, Hebrew Union College.

I.

THE FIRST VOWEL OF THE IMPERFECT TENSE-STEM.

The present forms of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic imperfect of the simple stem (Qal, Pe'al, I.) show the complete *absence* of a vowel between the first and second radicals, cf. the types يَقْتُلُ , تَصِفُ , يَكْتَل . Hence the possibility of forms like يَفَل , يَنَش , يَتَن , تَخَف , etc. Because it is commonly supposed that Old Arabic possesses a fuller vocalization than any other Semitic dialect—cf. e. g. an ordinary word like أَزَاع = أُزِع = أَزِيع (أَزِيع)—the inference is evidently justified that, where an Arabic form presents vocalic scarcity, we are treading upon common Semitic ground. The type yaqtul, etc. is pronounced to be the original (Wright, *Comp. Gram.*, p. 181), while the Hebrew עָמַד and עָמְרוּ are represented as “Zerdehnungen” of the archetype and as resultants of a phonetic decay peculiar to Hebrew (*ibid.*, p. 91 sq.; Stade, *Hebraeische Gram.*, § 102). I think that I have sufficient evidence to prove that the form yaqtul, etc. presupposes an earlier form of the type yaqvtul (by v I indicate a full vowel the exact character of which I propose to determine in the second part of my paper), etc.

I. Argument from *consistency*. Philippi, in an article published in the *Morgenlaendische Forschungen* (pp. 69–106), which it was not my privilege to peruse till shortly before writing these lines, has made it a point to derive all other stems of the verb from the simple stem, or, as he calls it, the “Grundstamm,” not merely the أَنْزَاع of the type فَاعِل a. فَعَل , but notably the augmented stems. Thus, أَنْقَتَلَ compared with نَقَتَلَ = نَقَتَل goes back to na + qatal, saqtal to sa + qatal, 'aqtal to 'a + qatal, etc. (p. 73). He compares (p. 74) لَكَتَب = لَكَتَب , evidently thinking of لَعَبَا Num. VIII. 24, to which I would add הַצִּפִּינוּ , Ex. II. 3, and of nominal prefixed forms מִמְרָרִים Job IX. 18; מִמְתְּקִים Cant. V. 16 and others. The reason for the disappearance of the first vowel of the stem is not far to seek. It appears from several sources (cf. *ibid.*, p. 78) that prefixed forms, unless stronger motives came into play, allowed in earliest times the

main accent to fall upon the syllable containing the prefix, thus subjecting the next vowel to complete want of stress and hence of articulation. Why not be consistent and derive yaqtul, etc. from an older ya'qv̄tul, etc.?

II. Argument from *infinitives* of the type qutl a. qetōl. Philippi (l. c., p. 81) perceives the difficulty of explaining Arabic yaqtul (I substitute qtl for his ktb) compared with the infinitive qutl (kutb), with which he puts together Hebrew כְּתַבִּי (with hard ב—e. g. הִכֵּי Gen. xix. 21—which is by the way the exception; the rule is כְּתַבִּי) as over against כְּתַב. Shall we believe in migration (metathesis) of vowels? Lagarde, (*Uebersicht*, p. 153) knows that qutl and qetōl go back to one common form, qutul, of which the former is the paroxytone and the latter the oxytone. Why not go a step further, and say that yaqtul = ya' + qutul?

III. Argument from the *imperative*. To the type yaqtul belongs the imperative أَقْتُلْ = Hebrew קָטַל which latter, if compared with קָטַלָה—e. g. מָלַךְ Jd. ix. 8—a. קָטַלְנִי—e. g. הִרְגֵנִי Num. xi. 15—leaves no doubt as to what the ׀ in קָטַל stands for. The imperative is nothing but the imperfect (jussive) minus the preformative (of the second person). Hence קָטַל qutul' presupposes ta' + qutul.

IV. Argument from a *comparison of the imperfects* I., II. and VII. The imperfect forms of the intensive and N reflexive stems (II. a. VII.) show the existence of a vowel (the same vowel) between the first and second radicals: יִקְטִיל יִנְקִטֵּל, נִקְטֵל, נִנְקֵל. The Arabic language has many imperfects in the I. of the type yaqtil. In Hebrew we find יָתַן, יָלַד, etc., in Biblical Aramaic יָפַל, in Syriac نَحَص. We may also compare the impf. of the IV.: یُكْتَل and, without for the present laying stress upon the vowel of the preformative, put down the following imperfect types as related: I. yaqtil, II. yuqattil, IV. yuqtil, VII. yanqatil. Does the relationship merely consist in the identity of the second vowel of the stem (i), or does it extend further? The analogy of the perfect on the one hand, and the additional identity of the first vowel of the stem (a) in two of the imperfects (II. and VII.) should help to answer our question. If, with Philippi (l. c.), we see in qattal and qâtal (III.) modified types of qatal, we shall have similarly to look for a "Grundstamm" to (yu) qattil, i. e. we have to postulate ya' + qatil, which indeed we find reproduced also in yanqatil = ya'naqa'til. The first vowel of the stem remains if stressed, and disappears if unaccented. Thus, ya'qatil becomes yaqtil.

V. Argument from *Ethiopic*. Ethiopic (cf. Wright, l. c., p. 181) indeed has preserved the type yaqatil in allowing the first vowel of the stem to be

accented: $y\acute{e}q\acute{a}t\acute{e}l$. It uses the latter form for the Arabic indicative, while it differentiates the type $y\acute{e}q\acute{t}\acute{e}l = ya'qatil$ for the subjunctive and jussive.

VI. Argument from *infinitives of the type qatil*. The relation of the s. c. infinitive construct in Hebrew to the imperfect is obvious (cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 152): $קָטַל : יִקְטֹל = קָטַל : יִקְטֹל = הִקְטֹל : יִקְטֹל$, etc. We must agree with Professor Barth (l. c., p. 103 sq.) in connecting nouns like $גָּזַל$ etc. with $יִגְזֹל$ etc. Hence $קָטַל$ is the exact prototype of $קָטַל, הִקְטֹל$ etc. in the same manner as the s. c. infin. absolute $קָטַל$ explains $קָטַל, נִקְטֹל$ etc. (*ibid.*, p. 72) and $יִגְזֹל = ya\ g\acute{a}zil$.

We shall now proceed to our next task, viz. to determine the exact character of the first vowel in the "Grundstamm" of the imperfect, the existence of which in common Semitic we have endeavored to prove from six independent points of view. Some of the sources already adduced will help us in obtaining our aim.

I. The imperative forms in Hebrew and Arabic. $קָטַל$ compared with $קָטַלְנִי, קָטַלְנִי$ (v. *supra*) and the rarer $קָטַלְנִי$ —e. g. $מָלַכְנִי$ Jd. ix. 10—points to qutul with which goes Arabic $uqtul$, i. e., the prefixed element is identical with the disappearing stem vowel.— $كَبَّرَ, كَبَّرْ, كَبِّرْ, اِفْعَلْ$ point to qital, $اَضْرِبْ$ to qitil. Hence we obtain the following three types: 1. qutul; 2. qitil; 3. qital. The first and second forms are at once intelligible; not so the third. For if the principle be found in the assimilation of the first vowel to the second, we should expect the third type to be qatal.

II. The common Hebrew infinitives $קָטַל$, with suffixes $קָטַלְנִי, קָטַלְכֶם = qorobekem, שָׁבַב$ with $שָׁבַבְנִי$ point again to 1. qutul; 3. qital. If Barth's explanation of forms like $נִפְלַם$ (Hebr. imperf. $יָפַל$, Bibl. Aram. $יָפַל$), $שָׁבַרְנִי$ (Hebr. $יִשְׁבֹּר$, Arab. $يَشْبُر$) etc. (l. c., p. 104) be correct, we shall equally obtain for the second type the form qitil. In Arabic, we find as ordinary infinitive forms: 1. qutul, e. g. $قَتَلَ$ (impf. $يَقْتُلُ$); 2. qatil, e. g. $كَذَبَ$ (impf. $يَكْذِبُ$), which type is easily recognized in Hebrew $בָּעַר, גָּרַר, גָּזַל$, etc.; 3. qatal, e. g. $חָרַג$ cf. $יִחַרְגְּ$, represented in Hebrew in forms like $אָשַׁם, צָמָא, רָעַב$ (impff. $יִאָשֶׁם, יִצְמָא, יִרָעַב$); also qital and qutul (for fuller examples cf. Barth, l. c., pp. 101, 103, 105, 106). If qutul be the paroxytone of qutul (v. *supra*), Arab. $كَذِبَ$ by the side of $كَذِبَ$ can be explained only by assuming $*كَذِبَ$ (paroxytone) as a medium (cf. Lagarde, l. c., p. 8, l. 25—p. 9, l. 12); similarly Hebr.

גִּיל compared with גִּיל; hence the existence of 2. qitil in Arabic is proven. It is needless for me to reproduce Professor Barth's list of nouns, the connection of which with the imperfect tense-stem can not be doubted. I must refer the reader to the book itself. Thus from the various forms of imperfect nouns we obtain the following types for the imperfect tense-stem: 1. qatul, qutul; 2. qatil, qitil; 3. qatal, qital, qutal.

III. The imperfect forms of the II. and VII. prove the existence of 2. qatil.

IV. Similarly Ethiopic *yəqátəl*.

V. The vowel of the preformative may be taken as an index of the character of the lost stem vowel. *أَقْتُلْ*, *أَفْعَلْ*, *أَضْرِبْ* justify this assumption. Hence *يَقْتُلْ* points to *yaqatul*, *تَمِضْ* *يَقْمُطْ* to *yuqutul*. (I think that *yīqtōl* stands for *yōqtōl*, cf. *תוֹךְ* + *וֶן* = *תִּכּוֹן*, *רֹאשׁ* + *וֶן* = *רֹאשׁוֹן*, etc., notably *חֲצִינוּ* *ψ* CXXIX. 7 compared with *חֲצִי* Neh. v. 13 a. *חֲצִי* Is. XLIX. 22; cf. also Barth, l. c., p. 24; also *Θοδύρ*, *Θεδύρ* = *תְּדִמֶר*—Lagarde, l. c., p. 125 note.) *يَفْعَلْ* presupposes *yaqatal*, *يَقْبِرْ*—*yiqital*; *يَضْرِبْ* points to *yaqatil*, *يִתֵּן* to *yiqitil*. We obtain again the types: 1. qatul, qutul; 2. qatil, qitil; 3. qatal, qital.

VI. Hebrew *יַעֲמֹד*, *יַעֲשֶׂה* = *ya'amud*, *ya'ašamû*. With the former compare *עָמֹד* = *עִמְדָּה*. We find once more: 1. qatul; 3. qatal.

VII. *Ἰσαάκ* cf. *יִצְחָק* Gen. XXI. 6 leads us to postulate 3. qatal.

VIII. Occasional Hebrew forms—*תַּעֲבֹדֶם* Ex. XX. 5; XXIII. 24; Deut. v. 9; *נַעֲבֹדֶם* Deut. XIII. 3; *רָעָה* *ψ* CXXXVIII. 6; *הָאֲהָבִי* Pr. I. 22—prove 1. qutul; 2. qitil; 3. qital.

IX. Notably forms like *יָקִים* and *יָבִין* are virtually *yaquwum* a. *yabi-yin* (not *yaqwum* a. *yabyin*). Hence we find again 1. qutul; 2. qitil. Similarly *יָבֵא* = *yabawa'* points to 3. qatal.

The result of our study may be summed up as follows. We find three types of the imperfect tense-stem:

1. qatul, or, with assimilation of vowels, qutul.
2. qatil, “ “ “ “ “ qitil.
3. qatal, “ “ dissimilation “ “ qital (qutal).

The relation of the perfect to the imperfect tense-stem may be represented as follows:

1. Perf. qatul. Imperf. qatul.
2. “ qatil. “ qatal.
3. “ qatal “ qatil.

The symbolism of tense vocalization is thus rendered complete. Qatul for qatil belongs to a later development, when, as in Hebrew, verbs of the type יִכַּל assume the form of that of יִזְקֶן, and yaqtil becomes impracticable as it may be confounded with the corresponding form of the causative stem which is certainly of later age. יִּקְטֹל and יִקְטִיל are other attempts at differentiation; still cf.

יַעֲלֶה "he goes up" and "he leads up."

NOTE.—I should throw out the suggestion that the other stems of the Semitic verb are not only *derived* from the simple stem, but are much posterior to it in time. It seems that the tripartite mechanism of the simple stem served for a long time to render the formation of new stems unnecessary. Cf. فَرَعَ "to be

idle," فَرَعَ "to bring to an end;" הַיָּד הַקְּצָרָה "Is the hand of Yahweh too short?" and זֹרַע עֲוֹלָה יִקְצֹר-אֹיִן "He who soweth wrong-doing, reapeth (= cuts short) trouble" (Num. xi. 23 a. Pr. xxii. 8). When the additional stems were formed, some of the old forms remained. Hence we find combinations like נָגַשׁ (N reflex.) a. נִגַּשׁ, נָפַטַר (Mishnic) a. נִפְטַר I Sam. xix. 10, נָבִיִּים a. נְבִיִּים (both Mishnic, the latter in accordance with the traditional pronunciation, though a mistaken zeal leads purists to read נְבִיִּים).

MUŠANNĪTU(M).

By MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Pa.

Peiser in his *Babylonische Verträge des Berliner Museums*, pp. 305–6, discusses the term *mušannitum* (written *mu-ša-an-ni-tum* and *mu-ša-ni-tum*), which is of frequent occurrence in the legal literature of the Babylonians, without, however, reaching any satisfactory conclusion. He thinks that it may refer to some kind of construction for purposes of irrigation. Tallqvist leaves the word untranslated (*Die Sprache der Contracte Nabu-naids*, p. 139).

There is a Talmudical term מְשׁוֹנִיתָא, with which I believe the Babylonian word is identical.* The word מְשׁוֹנִיתָא occurs in the Talmud in the sense of (a) jaw, (b) cliff, grotto, and thirdly, embankment. In two passages it is expressly applied to a field. *Baba Meši'â*, Fol. 108b, we read "אֶפְסִיק מ'" "a precipitous mound separated the fields" and again *ibid.*, 109a, "אֹהֶרֶר לִיה מ'" "he surrounded the fields with an embankment" for which a variant has גִּרְרָה "he fenced it in."

It is in the sense of "embankment" in which *mušannitum* appears to be used in the Babylonian legal tablets, the reference being to the protection which the physical conditions of the Euphrates valley rendered necessary in order to protect fields and property from being damaged by the rise of the numerous streams in the rainy season. The artificial canals would of course be similarly affected by this season and embankment works would thus be rendered necessary in all sections of the valley even where canals existed, the waters of which might be directed into the fields during the dry season. The solidity of these embankments was further assured by the use of wooden or iron beams employed in their construction and acting as a support to the earth heaps. With this brief explanation, we may pass to an examination of some of the passages in which the term occurs.

* See the passages in Levy's Talmudical Dictionary where, however, the various meanings of the word are not properly distinguished. Through the courtesy of my father, I am enabled to quote from his manuscript the article on the word as it will appear in Part IX. of his Talmudic Dictionary. מְשׁוֹנִיתָא f. (denom. שׁוֹנֵן tooth) (1) jaw, *Erub.* 100a *** (2) cliff, bluff, grotto, *Gen. R. s.* 10¹ דִּכְמָא מ' the bluffs at Caesarea, *Tan.* 23^a *Midr Til.* to *Ps. cxvii.* לִיה אֹהֶרֶר a grotto formed around him; *B. Meši'â* 108^b אֶפְסִיק מ'" a precipitous mound separated the fields; *ib.* 109^a אֹהֶרֶר לִיה מ'" he surrounded the fields; (MS. Hamburg גִּרְרָה fenced it in) with an embankment.

Tablet No. 910 of Strassmaier's *Nabunaid* texts is a receipt for dates delivered in part as an annual assessment, and in part *ana dullu ša mušanitum ša nâr Sumanti*, i. e. "for the embankment work at the Sumanti canal."

Nabunaid No. 770 gives a list of workmen engaged *ša dullu ina eli mušannitum ša Gilušu* "for the work in connection with the embankment at Gilušu."

Further operations at this same place are referred to in Nbd., No. 784, which is a receipt for a variety of iron material and instruments required: *ana eli mušannitum ša NIH Gilušu*, "for the embankment of NIH Gilušu;"* and again in Nbd. 1080 where 80 workmen engaged in the enterprise—which must have been one of considerable magnitude—are enumerated in groups as they were furnished by the contractors.

Nbd. No. 1002 testifies to the payment in silver *ana dullu ša mušanitum ša Hallab* for the embankment work at Hallab.

In a text from the days of Darius published by Peiser, *Babyl. Verträge*, No. 143, there is a reference to three beams that are to be delivered *ina muḫḫi mušannitum ša Kar-ri Taš-me-tum* "in connection with the embankment work at Karri-Tašmetum." From this passage as well as from Nbd. No. 784, it appears that the term *dullu* might be omitted without affecting the force of the phrase.

Nbd. No. 6 (as No. 910) is a receipt for 20 kur of dates, full measure (?) (*i-mit-tum*), joint ownership in a house *u edutum ša eli mušanitum* "and choice dates† for embankment" where *dullu* (= work) is again to be supplied.

Lastly, in Strassmaier's tablets of the reign of Cyrus, No. 180, ll. 10 and 12, in an assessment list of dates due to the Ebarra temple of Babylon, there are included two payments of this kind, one of 17 kur, another of 26 kur made in lieu of the sum of one mana and one mana plus 11 šekels respectively, charged *ana dullu ša mušanitum*, "for embankment work." From this we may be permitted to conclude that the Babylonian temples were not only, as we know from various sources, great business corporations (Peiser, *Babyl. Vertr.*, pp. xvii-xxix) that farmed out lands for cultivation, but that they also accepted contracts for land improvements. The passages above given will suffice to show that the meaning proposed for *mušannitum* answers the requirements and accords with the context involved.

A word remains to be said as to the form of the Talmudical and of the Babylonian term. The former מְשׁוּנִיתָא is a form like מְפֻשְׁטִיתָא ("stretch-

* Seed of NIH(?) Giluša is spoken of Nbd. No. 690, 13, and the same place with the determinative for city is found Nbd. No. 398, 37.

† I connect *edutum* with Talmudic עֵדִית, which signifies "choice," but reserve the proof for another occasion.

ing out,") mašnunîtha, becoming by contraction m'sunnîtha; and so far as the ordinary meanings of the word are concerned ("jaw, cliff, grotto, etc.,") it may be regarded as a home production. In its technical sense, however, as applied to the embankment along a canal as a protection to fields and property, what more natural than that the term should, like so many other technical terms pertaining to architecture, commerce and the industrial arts, have been borrowed? With the Babylonian mušannitu before us, there seems hardly any reasonable doubt that such was the case. Upon this supposition, the slight variation between the Babylonian and the Talmudical form can readily be accounted for. The transposition of the Waw from behind the first letter to a position after the second letter—i. e. משונתא instead of מושניתא—is the natural consequence of the attraction exercised by the already existing משונתא. It is altogether likely that with more manuscripts at our disposal, a variant would be encountered with the Waw after the Mem or with the omission of the Waw altogether. The differentiation here proposed between משניתא and מושניתא does not involve any difference in the underlying stem. For the latter as for the former, and also therefore for the Babylonian mušannitum, the stem is שנין. Though the writing with one *t* is unusual, while at the same time far from unparalleled,* mušannitum may very well be the feminine participle of the Pîl (II. 1) mušanninatum = mušannintum = mušanittum = mušanîtu(m). Tallqvist, it may be noted, also suggests the long quality of the vowel *i* in the word. The spelling with one *n* (Nbd. Nos. 910, 1002, 6) instead of two is of course a very common variant. The use of the word in the sense of embankment is deduced without difficulty from the fundamental notion of "to be pointed" attaching to שנין. In Biblical usage already, שן is the "point of the rock" as well as "tooth." The embankment forming a kind of wall and supplied perhaps with turrets, as the ordinary wall of fortification was, could appropriately be designated as a "pointed" or a "turreted" object.

* Cf. ummātu = ummantu; ištātu = ištantu (cf. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Gr.*, § 49, b) with only one *t* despite the assimilated *n*, but lengthening of vowel instead of reduplication.

ASSYRIOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH.D.,

The University of Chicago.

I.

This is the first of a Series of Notes—lexicographical and textual—to be published in *HEBRAICA*. They are based on Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Handwoerterbuch* = *HWB.*, and my *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the K. Collection of the British Museum* = *LK.*

u 2, Arnolt, *DAL.* p. 1 *not, nicht*, but cf. K. 979, *LK.* 47, obv. 7-11:7 ina ši-a-ri ša ba-a-di⁸ ri*-in-ku ina alu Tar-bi-ši⁹ immêru niķê¹⁰ ša šarri in-ni-pa-ša¹¹ a-na-ku-u al-lak, übermorgen there will be a rinku(=rimku, רִמְקָ) libation (pour-offering) in the city of Tarbisi and royal sacrifices will be offered. Shall I go? Cf. also K. 522, *LK.* 31, 9 sqq. For ba-a-di, cf. K. 561, *LK.* 101, obv. 11: âmu V I^{kam} a-na ba-a-di and K. 519, *LK.* 108, rev. 5: ina ti-ma-li ki-i ba-di = بعد

A. BA. Delitzsch, *HWB.* p. 4, comments as follows: "A. BA. mit oder ohne Determ. amêl, s. u. dupšarru." He does not say anything about this writing in the place mentioned. Note the reading, amêlu AB. BA. MEŠ, K. 1139, obv. 2 and K. 620, *LK.* 91, obv. 13.

Agappu. Cf. also šu-pur a-gap-pi, K. 573, *LK.* 180, obv. 5.

The plural of egirtu, which Arnolt, *DAL.* p. 16, takes from an oral communication with me, and for which he does not give a reference, is found in K. 619, *LK.* 174, rev. 12 = e-gir-a-te-šu-nu. This form is to be inserted in Delitzsch, *HWB.* p. 18.

Neither Delitzsch nor Arnolt gives a satisfactory treatment of adanniš. The former places it under a root אֲדַן. The latter makes it parallel with danniš—after Bezold, and remarks "perhaps=a(na)danniš(u)" Cf., however, my note in *HEBRAICA*, X. p. 107:† "In *Oriental Diplomacy*, Bezold has placed both danniš and adanniš under the root danânu, without further comment. I am inclined to think that he is correct in this view, and would add the following: danniš is used interchangeably with adanniš in 1, 6; 2, 6; 3, 7, etc. Ana danniš = andanniš = addanniš

* Šar is a typographical mistake. My copy of the original has ri.

† This was published before the appearance of Arnolt's *Concise Dictionary*, etc.

(K. 519, 3, 7, *LK.* 108; K. 532, 3, 7, *LK.* 109, etc.) = *adanniš* (the form in common use) = *adaniš* (K. 485, rev. 8, *LK.* 112)."

No derivation is given for *aḥamiš*. Under *a-ḥa-iš* = *aḥamiš*, such forms as *a-ḥa-a-a-iš*, K. 63^b, rev. 8, 18, *LK.* 168, should be cited. In both of these places, *a-ḥa-a-a-iš* is preceded by the sign for *ištu*, *ultu*. Cf. also such forms as *a-ḥi-ia-ši*, Rm 2, 1, rev. 14 and *a-ḥa-ia-ši*, Rm 2, 464, obv. 11.*

Both Delitzsch and Arnolt have accepted my textual reading at the end of line 46, col. III. of Cyl. A. Esarhaddon, reading *aḫ-ta-bi-šu a-ḥu-lap* instead of Abel-Winckler's impossible *a-ḥu-ta*. Arnolt quotes this passage under *aḥulāp(i)*, *DAL.* p. 30 and again under *aḥūtu*, p. 31. Only one of these readings can be correct. Arnolt has accepted *aḥulap* in *HEBRAICA*, and hence his double treatment of the text of this passage in *DAL.* 30, 31 must be put down to the careless editing of his notes.

* *aḥāru* receives imperfect treatment from both Delitzsch and Arnolt. Delitzsch says: "II. 1 * * * astronomischer, bes. auf Mond und Venusstern bezüglicher term. technicus." Arnolt remarks: " * * * *uḥḥuru* = ἐκλείπειν, of moon and stars." Both cite few examples. This verb is often used without a technical astronomical meaning. Cf. Rm 2, 2, obv. 15; K. 625, 9 *LK.* 131 (*uḥ-ḥa-ru-u-ni*); K. 63^b, obv. 11, rev. 8 and 11 (*uḥ-ḥu-ur*), *LK.* 168; K. 1396, 12, *LK.* 185 (*li-iḥ-ḥu-ra*), etc., etc.

Under * *𐎶𐎵* *eṭēru*, II, Delitzsch notices the use of *eṭēru* with *ina*. Cf. also K. 595, *LK.* 6, obv. 24, sqq., where we have the form *lu-u-ṭe-ru* with *ana*: *ilāni rabûti kališunu ša šamê iršitim ana šarri bêlija adu zêrišu šumšu ummânâtîšu lu-u-ṭe-ru ina ki-ni-šu-nu lu-še-ri-bu* = may the great gods—all of them—of heaven and earth give protection to the king, my lord, together with his seed, his name, his armies: into their nest (protection) may they cause [him] to enter. There is another interesting passage in this letter. The verbal form from which we derive the forms *paršumu*, *puršumu*, etc., etc. which are of such frequent occurrence in the Letter literature—both with and without a determinative—has, so far as I know, not been found. But, cf. rev. 3, sqq.: *ilāni rabûti ša šamê iršitim ana balât napšâti ša šarri bêlija nu-ša-al-laṭ šarru bêli ana mâr mârâni lu-par-ši-im* (𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎵) = to the great gods of heaven and earth for the life of the king, our lord, we pray. May the king live long enough to have grandchildren (lit.: to grandchildren grow old).

To the citations under * *𐎶𐎵* add *a-a-u-ti alânišu*, K. 63^b, obv. 8, *LK.* 168.

* Cf. my article on *The Letters of the Rm 2 Collection in the British Museum* in *Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie*, VIII. pp. 341, sqq

† Cf. K. 1024, rev. 6-9, *LK.* 28: *ana-ku ûme mâšu ina muḥḥi napšâti ša bêlija u-ṣal-la*.

For the forms *illuku*, *il-lu-ku il-la-ku-ni*, K. 574, obv. 13, *LK.* 173, cf. Craig in *HEBRAICA*, X. p. 110. The I. 3 form occurs in an interesting passage in K. 185, rev. 6-9, *LK.* 74: *a-me-lu šû III. šanâti ina ku-u-ri u ni-is-sa-te it-ta-na-al-la-ak*. Cf. also *i-li-kan-a-ni*, Rm 2, 1 obv. 21 and *i-ta-lak*, Rm 2, 1, obv. 13.

𐤀𐤋𐤋: *tallultu*. Delitzsch cites the single well-known passage, V. R. 6, 25. Cf. also K. 527, obv. 13sq., *LK.* 32: *ina eli^{imêru} sîsi dan-ni ša tal-lul-tu šamâtu Kûsi rišûni ana e-rab ali ana^{alu} Sabbanat*, etc.

The plural of *elippu*, ship = *elippâni* occurs in K. 609, rev. 8, *LK.* 126, written MA. MES + ni. The connection is uncertain, since the last three lines of this tablet are vitrified.

Under *𐤀𐤌𐤍, add the following forms, found in the badly broken tablet, K. 591, *LK.* 22: obv. 7, *i-tam-me-ru*; rev. 9, *lit-me-ru*, rev. 12, *i-tam-me-ir*. The last line of the reverse also contains a form of this verb. The first sign is broken off, but it can easily be restored.

The Assyrian Letters furnish us with a large number of interesting plural forms. A new plural of *imêru*, ass (usual plur. *imêrê*) is found in the name of a city in Rm 2, 1, rev. 13: *ina^{alu} Dûr-imêr pl. + te = Dûr-imêrâ(ê)te*. Cf. also the new plural of *bithallu*, noticed by Craig in *HEBRAICA*, X. p. 109,—in K. 469, rev. edge 22, *LK.* 138: *amêlu ša bit-ḫal-la-ti-šu-nu ina pânija i-za-zu*. Cf. Delitzsch, *BAS.* I. p. 211. In K. 631, obv. 5, *LK.* 136, we have: *ardâni ša šarri bêlija^{amêlu} ḫaza-pl. + phonetic complement ni*. Cf. also *egirâte* and *elippâni* above and *išparâte* below. In this connection, I would say that Arnolt's reading *ûmûti*, as the second plural of *ûmu*, day, is incorrect, and that the only passage given in support of this reading is incorrectly cited. Further notice of the plurals of *ûmu* will be taken in a review of Arnolt's Dictionary.

A good example of the fem. plur. of *unûtu* is found in a short inscription of Ašurbanipal published by S. Arthur Strong in the *JRAS.* 1891, p. 469: * *u-na-a-te ḫurâši kaspi sipirri parzilli iṣê u abnê êpuš*. The form *a-nu-ut* is to be added to those given by Delitzsch. Cf. K. 1101 + K. 1221, rev. 5sq., *LK.* 152: * * * XX. *ma-na kaspi ša a-nu-ut bît na-mu-ra-a-te ša šarri ša ummi šarri * * **

Along with *annuṣim*, we have the form *a-nu-šim*; cf. Rm 2, 1, rev. 30. I do not find any mention by Delitzsch of the form *an-nu-ri* which is of frequent occurrence in the Letters. It must have the same meaning as *annuṣim*, and I am of the opinion that the sign *ri* is to be given the value *šim* in this word.

* Arnolt, *DAL.*, p. 73, has cited this passage from an oral communication with me.

An interesting word not noticed by Delitzsch is found in K. 903, rev. 3, *LK.* 124, viz.: ana bît i-si-te-ia. The last line of the obverse (9) is to be restored as i-si-te.

Issi, isi, Delitzsch places under **יסי** with the remark: "gleichbedeutend, nach Haupt auch etymologisch eins mit itti *mit*." Hilprecht in his *Assyriaca*, which has just appeared, p. 47, argues with great force for the root **יסי**.* Cf. the following forms not noticed by Delitzsch: is-si-e-šu, Rm. 2, 468, rev. 8; i-si-e-šu, K. 596, obv. 22, *LK.* 190; is-si-e-a, K. 558, rev. 14, *LK.* 153 and K. 653, obv. 14, *LK.* 154; i-si-e-a, K. 63^b, rev. 16, *LK.* 168 and K. 596, obv. 17, *LK.* 190.

Under **יסי**, Delitzsch accepts my restoration and reading of Esarhaddon, Cyl. A., VI. 13, viz.: ina šipir ḥarrakûte e-si-ḳaki-rib-ša. Cf. *AEI.*, p. 16. Arnolt's notes on this passage in *HEBRAICA* are, to say the least, of no value.

There are some interesting forms of **יסי** in the Letters. Cf. K. 515, *LK.* 89: obv. 11-13, u elippu ša^{amēlu} piḥâti ša^{alu} Arrapḥa ina libbia^{lu} U-pi-a ne-bu-ru tu-pa-aš; rev. 1-5, * * * elippu[ša]^{amēlu} piḥâti ša^{alu} Arrap[ḥa] lu-u ta-li-ik ina^{alu} * * ni-bu-ru lu-tu-piṭ-iš; rev. 10-14, ^{amēlu} ṣabê ša piḥâti ša^{alu}* ina^{alu}* * ni-bu-ru u-pu-šu. Cf. also tu-up-pa-aš, K. 619, obv. 15, *LK.* 174, and lu-pi-iš, K. 596, obv. 26, *LK.* 190. The form nîpišu occurs frequently.

Under eṣadu (**עסד**), cf. K. 1057, obv. 6, *LK.* 93: ūmu XI.^{kan} e-ša-du inamātu Aššur. The rest of this text is badly broken. In a very difficult and broken letter of Arad-Nanâ, we have the form iṣ-ša-di. Cf. K. 576, *LK.* 110, obv. 8: ina elî iṣ-sa-di ša šarri bêli [iṣpura]ni mâ (the tablet is broken here), and rev. 12-13: ba-si iṣ-ša-di i-ḥa-li-ḳu. At present, I do not know whether this iṣṣadi is to be connected with **עסד**, or not.

Under erêbu, add the form ir-rab, K. 629, obv. 9, *LK.* 65.

Under urâsu, cf. the interesting form ^{amēlu} u-ra-su-tu in K. 636, *LK.* 209. This letter reads as follows: ¹a-na šarri bêli-ia ²ardi-ka Nabû-šum-še-ši ³apil Nabû-rêš-i-ši ⁴lu-u šul-mu a-na šarri bêli-ia ⁵Ašur Ištar a-na šarri ⁶bêli-ia lik-ru-bu ⁷^{amēlu} iṣparu ⁸pi-ša e-kur ⁹iš-bi-šu-nu la iḳ-ṣur-u-ni rev. 1 ^{amēlu} u-ra-su-tu ²e-pu-uš. The feminine of iṣparu (uṣparu) is not given by Delitzsch.

* Gegen issi = itti speciell spricht der Umstand, dass das Wort sowohl bei Asurnasirapal als in IV. R. 2 61 in demselben Texte mit itti vorkommt, das auch in der Briefliteratur, wo es sich am häufigsten findet, beide neben einander gebraucht werden. * * * Die einfachste Erklärung bleibt jedenfalls, dass issi genau so von **יסי** gebildet ist, wie itti von **יחסי**. Bedeutet ittišu demgemäss ursprünglich "seine Seite," i. e., "an seiner Seite, mit ihm," so bedeutet issišu zunächst "sein Helfer, sein Beistand," i. e., ebenfalls "mit ihm."

† My text reads šî, but I am inclined to think that this character is pi.

The plural form is found in a letter of Sennacherib, K. 125, *LK.* 196, edge 24: f. UŠ-BAR-pl-te.

To the forms under שָׂרָא, add ni-ra-aš found in K. 609, obv. 10 sqq., *LK.* 126: [a]-na-ku an-na-ka ina^{alu} Kar-šarukîn libnâti am-mar arḫu NIR iš-šu-u-ni bîtannu a-ra-ši-pi u zêru^{pl} ni-ra-aš.

Ašlu is found in K. 527, rev. 10, *LK.* 32; ina elî ašli. The sign following is broken.

Cf. the peculiar I. 2 forms of etêḫu, viz.: i-ta-ta-ka, Rm 2, 4, rev. 14 and i-ta-at-ku, K. 469, obv. 11, *LK.* 138.

A word not noticed by Delitzsch, and of frequent occurrence in the Letters, is the conjunction ba-si, ba-a-si. Cf. for ba-si, K. 1197, rev. 5, *LK.* 15; K. 494, obv. 9, *LK.* 19; K. 576, rev. 12, *LK.* 110 = ba-si iṣ-ša-di i-ḫa-li-ḫu; K. 596, obv. 7, *LK.* 190. For ba-a-si, cf. K. 1168, obv. 10, *LK.* 49.

Delitzsch's treatment of bašlu is unsatisfactory. The meaning "gekocht" does not suit the context of K. 1101 + K. 1221, *LK.* 152, rev. 3, sqq.

The most important text for the study of galâbu is a letter from Akkullanu, K. 122, *LK.* 43. Cf. the form gal-lu-bu, rev. 4 and 28; and ug-da-lib-šu, rev. 7. In rev. 17, we have pi-lu-ub. At present, I am inclined to regard the pi as an incorrect reading for gal. It will be necessary again to consult the original of this difficult text.

For גַּמַּר and גִּשָּׁר, cf. the broken letter, K. 554, *LK.* 100, rev. 14: i-su-ri gi-iš-ru nu-ga-mar šarru bêli-ka gi-iš-ru. Cf. also the form ug-da-me-ir, K. 690, rev. 4, *LK.* 201.

Another word not noticed by Delitzsch is the catchword in a badly rubbed letter of Balasî, K. 555, *LK.* 76. Cf. obv. 7: ina elî gi-sa-ru-u ša šarri bêli iṣ[puran]ni. These lines are very badly rubbed, but rev. 4, gi-sa-ru-u damḫu, makes this reading absolutely certain.

I must take exception to Delitzsch's treatment of the text of Esarhaddon, Cyl. B. I. 9. III. R. 15 reads gir-ri-i-ka. Delitzsch, *ALS*.³ p. 117, reads ga with *sic*! In *HWB.* he remarks: "ga las richtig schon Layard." The reading gir, though unexpected, must be accepted. Cf. my *AEI.*, p. 32: "According to my reading (so Pinches) gir-ri-i-ka stands on the orig." Cf. also Haupt, *BAS.* I. p. 167: "Ich habe die Stelle zusammen mit Pinches und Dr. Harper genau untersucht und mich dabei überzeugt, dass das Zeichen vor -ri-ka in der That nicht ga, sonder gir ist." There are two or three other textual mistakes in Delitzsch's edition of Col. I. of this inscription. Line 15 is to be read: kima iṣṣuri si-si-in-ni, not si-er-in-ni. Cf. Haupt again, *BAS.* I. p. 167: "Auch mit seinem von mir (p. 19) von vornherein als das Wahrscheinlichste bezeichneten si-si-in-ni ist Harper im Rechte. Es steht wirklich so da, nicht si-er-in-ni wie Delitzsch bietet."

Under **𒌷𒌷**, Delitzsch should have noticed such forms as the following, which are of frequent occurrence in the Letter literature: ad-du-bu-ub, K. 602, rev. 16, *LK.* 23; K. 174, obv. 6-8, *LK.* 53 = ina elî ša šarri bēli iḫ-ban-ni mâ itti Bašî dubbu ad-du-bu-ub; K. 617, obv. 13, *LK.* 208 = i-si-šu-nu ad-du-bu-ub lib-bi u-sa-aš-kin-šu-nu; K. 625, rev. 8, *LK.* 131 = i-du-bu-bu; K. 569, rev. 9, *LK.* 78 = ni-id-du-bu-ub; K. 504, obv. 10-12, *LK.* 157 = [ina pa]-an šarri bēlija li-ru-bu šarru bēli i-si-šu-nu lid-bu-bu; etc.

For i-du-lu, cf. K. 619, obv. 23, *LK.* 174 and especially the short letter of Kabbu-ana-Ašur, K. 491, obv. 7, *LK.* 122. The letter reads as follows: a-na šarri bēlija ²ardika Kabbu-ana-Ašur, ³tibnu (pl.) (written ŠE. IN. NU. MEŠ) gab-bu ⁴ina mâtija a-na^{al}u Dûr-Šaru-kînna ⁵ša ina (here a break in the tablet) an-nu-šim ⁶amêlu mušar-kisâni ⁷i-da-tu-u-a i-du-lu ⁸tibnu (pl.) a-na II. šabê ⁹la-aš-šu u-ma-a ¹⁰mi-nu ša šarru bēli ¹¹i-ka-bu-u-ni. Reverse not inscribed.

Under **𒌷𒌷**, cf. also K. 63^b, rev. 26, *LK.* 163: la il-lak lu la i-dal-laḫ.

𒌷𒌷. Cf. K. 620, obv. 7 sqq., *LK.* 91: dam-ka-at a-dan-nis dul-la-šu-nu i-ba-ši ša dam-mu-ḫi e-pu-uš u-da-mu-ḫu. Cf. also the letter, K. 1396, *LK.* 185, from Nabû-bêl-šu-nu to Ašur-mu-dam-me-iḫ.

NOTES.

BY GEORGE A. BARTON, PH.D.,

Associate in Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College.

1. ON THE SEMITIC ISHTAR CULT.

In an article on "*Ashtoreth and Her Influence in the Old Testament*," published in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in 1891, I remarked that a deity, identical in name or in character or in both with Ashtoreth, is found among all the Semitic nations except the Ethiopians, and that our lack of knowledge of such a deity among them may be due solely to the paucity of non-Christian Ethiopic literary remains.* Since then I have published in *HEBRAICA*, Vols. IX. and X., some account of the Semitic Ishtar cult in all the Semitic lands except Abyssinia, but was until now unable to find any trace of it among the Ethiopians. At last, however, a deity bearing this name has come to light in this part of the Semitic area, so that we are assured that in some form this cult was coextensive with the Semitic peoples.

The evidence for this comes from Professor D. H. Müller's *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien*, Wien. 1894, which forms Heft III. of Vol. XLIII. of *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historisch Classe*. The inscriptions published in this work are edited from impressions made by J. Theodore Bent, Esq.

Tafel II. of Müller's work gives a fac-simile of an inscription of Ezana, son of Ela-Amida, king of Aksum, which is on p. 35 ff. edited, translated and accompanied with introduction and notes. The inscription is in the Geez script, and dates, as Professor Müller shows, from the early part of the fifth century A. D. The Sabaeen and Greek alphabets had been used in Abyssinia until the last half of the fourth century, as bilingual inscriptions, found in these tongues and published by Müller in this same work, prove. A reform in the script and the written language, by which the Geez writing was introduced, must, as Professor Müller points out, have occurred in the last years of Ela-Amida or the early years of Ezana. Ela-Amida began to rule at the latest about 380 A. D., so that the reform of the script could not have been accomplished before 400 A. D., and our inscription was probably written at no great distance in time afterwards.

Ezana, the writer, calls himself king of Aksum, and of several other places, including in the list Raidan and Saba, indicating that at this time the mother

* Cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. X., p. 77.

country of Sabaea, or Southern Arabia, was subject to the Ethiopians. The inscription records a victory of Ezana over the people of Adan, and after describing the onslaught, the number of slain and the prisoners, it proceeds l. 22, ff. : " And he turned back unharmed with the people of Adan and erected a throne here in Sada and committed him to the protection of Astar, Barras and Medr." The inscription then closes with an imprecation against the king's enemies somewhat in the strain of those at the end of the annals of the Assyrian kings.

This passage shows us that Christianity had not yet wholly triumphed in Abyssinia, and that chief among the deities of the royal pantheon was a god identical in name with Athtar, Ishtar and Astarte. It will be observed that the Ethiopic form of the name, Astar, resembles the Moabitic form Ashtar, which appears on the Moabite stone in the compound name Ashtar-Chemosh.

This name attests the presence of the Ishtar Cult in Abyssinia. As Astar is named first, we may infer that he was the leading deity of the pantheon. Athtar of South Arabia was, it will be remembered, a masculine deity. There is no definite hint in Ezana's inscription which reveals with certainty the gender of this god in Abyssinia. A close connection had, however, long existed between Abyssinia and South Arabia, as the use of the Sabaeen alphabet in the earlier Abyssinian inscriptions shows, and at the time of our inscription that connection was maintained by the extension of the dominion of the king of Aksum over the territories of Raidan and Saba. Indeed, it is altogether likely that the African Semites were emigrants from Sabaea. These facts, together with the fact that Astar is named first among the gods, would lead us to infer that Astar was, like Athtar, a masculine deity. We cannot, however, be certain of this until more evidence appears.

Since *The Semitic Ishtar Cult* which appeared in *HEBRAICA* was written, Fasculus II., Pars. IV., Tom. I., of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, i. e., of the Sabaeen portion of the *Corpus*, has appeared, as has Hommel's *Süd-Arabische Chrestomathie*, and Mordtman's *Himjarische Inschriften und Allerthümer*. This last work is Heft VII. of the Berlin Museum's *Mittheilungen aus den Orientalischen Sammlungen*. These works bring considerable new material within the reach of the American student, and add a few facts to his knowledge of the Athtar cult in South Arabia.

No. 102 of the *Corpus* is an inscription from a tablet which contained on its upper right hand corner the head of a bull. The inscription consecrated the tablet to Athtar, אֶשְׁתָּר, thus adding to our evidence that the bull or ox was sacred to this god. Cf. *HEBRAICA*, Vol. X., p. 58.

These added publications make still more clear the fact that there were in Southern Arabia a multiplicity of Athtars. An inscription reproduced from Halévy by Hommel on p. 78 of his *Chrestomathie*, distinguishes three Athtars,—Athtar of Kabas, Athtar of Yaharik, and Athtar of Yahar. So also in Mordt-

man's *Himjarische Inschriften* we have three Athtars distinguished,—Athtar of Mount Thanin (No. 862), Athtar of Banâ (No. 886), and Athtar of Kabid, the building (No. 874). Each place evidently had its Athtar as in ancient Palestine and Syria each place had its Baal.

Professor Hommel thinks the epithet שָׁרִקָן, "the rising," is an identification of Athtar with the morning star. This has in its favor the fact that Al-Uzza, the goddess of Mecca, who has been shown to be a form of Athtar, was identified with the morning star.* This is, I think, more probable than the identification with the rising sun, which I formerly favored.†

The inscription, No. 862, of Mordtman's *Himjarische Inschriften* contains a passage in which Athtar is apparently called אֲבִי עֲתָתָר, or "father Athtar." Mordtmann is not absolutely sure of the reading. It might, he says, be אֲלֵ עֲתָתָר, but he thinks אֲבִי the more probable. If this be correct, then Athtar was regarded as a father-god, and we have a trace in his character of the widespread conception of parentage and productivity, which was all but universally connected with the Ishtars and Astartes.

In treating of this, Müller calls attention to an inscription published by Derenbourg in the *Journal Asiatique*, 8 Série, Vol. II., p. 255. This inscription is of great interest as it confirms the theory of the late Professor W. R. Smith, which I followed in my *Ishtar Cult*, that Athtar was originally a mother goddess, and then developed into a masculine deity.‡ Derenbourg's inscription, translated, reads as follows:—

1. "Yaşbaḥ of Riyam son of Mauḳiṣ and Baus and his wife Karibat, possessor of
2. of the tribe of Sirwaḥ, a man of the king. They have consecrated to their lady Umm'athtar for
3. four sons, four images of pure gold because she blessed
4. them (viz.: Umm'athtar) with the boys and their daughters. And they lived—all these chil-
5. dren—and the spirits of both of them have been calmed by these children. May Umm-
6. 'athtar continue to bless his servants Yaşbaḥ and Karibat with well-formed children and to favor them themselves
7. and to favor their children. May Umm'athtar be gracious
8. and grant complete safety to the sons of Yaşbaḥ, Kharif, Magda'al, Ra-
9. babat and 'Am'atiḳ, the descendants of Mauḳiṣ and to their harvests and good fruits in
10. the land Nakhal Khurif, and in the pastures of their camels. To Umm'athtar.

* Cf. HEBRAICA, Vol. X., p. 64, W. R. Smith's *Kinship and Marriage in Ancient Arabia*, p. 197, and Wellhausen's *Reste Arabische Heidenthums*, p. 37. † Cf. HEBRAICA, Vol. X., pp. 56, 57 and 72.

‡ This inscription escaped my notice when I wrote the "Ishtar Cult."

This inscription not only represents Athtar as a goddess, but as a mother goddess, the giver of offspring, just the character in which Ishtar and Astarte usually appear. More than this, we catch in this inscription which comes from the very heart of the South Arabic territory the exact transition state between the mother goddess, so widely known elsewhere, and the masculine deity which otherwise appears in South Arabia. The deity is addressed by the compound name **אמע־תַּר**, (which we may resolve into its component parts and translate "mother Athtar,") and is moreover called **מֶרַת**, "the lady," and yet in the phrase **עב־דִּיהוּ**, "his servants," the deity is referred to as a male. The theory that a male deity was here developed out of a female is not, therefore, a mere theory; this inscription demonstrates it by revealing the transition in progress.

When the development was complete the idea of parentage which was inherent in the mother-goddess was still associated with this deity, and hence the epithet **אבע־תַּר**, which Mordtmann has noted in the inscription above mentioned.

The fact that Athtar was in South Arabia at one time a goddess, renders the theory advanced by W. R. Smith in his *Kinship*, and followed by me in the *Ishtar Cult*, that Al-Uzza is but an Athtar or Astarte, much more certain, as it becomes clear beyond a doubt that Athtar was once a goddess in Arabia.

II. ON THE GOD MUT.

In a paper published during the early part of 1894 in the *Oriental Studies* of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia on *Native Israelitish Deities*, it was proven, as I venture to think, that a god Maut, or Mut, was known in ancient Israel and Phœnicia, and that at least two proper names have been preserved in the Old Testament of which this divine name is a component part.

When that paper was published it seemed impossible to give any satisfactory account of the origin or the nature of such a deity; and in the absence of any other clue it was conjectured from the Hebrew pointing of the names referred to, that it might be but a personification of death. After it was too late even to add a foot-note to the paper in question, Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments* came to hand, on p. 294 of which an account is given of the discovery of some traces of the worship of the Egyptian mother-goddess Mut, near Gaza, in 1892. The natives then discovered in this locality several objects, among which were alabaster vases bearing the names of Amenophis III. and Teie, and another object bearing an inscription showing that it belonged to a temple of the goddess Mut, and that this temple had been erected by Amenophis II., grandfather of Amenophis III. This discovery indicates that near Gaza there was in the time of the eighteenth dynasty a shrine of the great Egyptian mother goddess, and suggests a different explanation of the goddess Mut in Palestine, viz., that the slight traces of the worship of Maut or Mut there

and in Phœnicia may be but survivals of the worship of the Egyptian goddess on Syrian soil from the early time when she became naturalized there under the influence of the Egyptian domination. The El-Amarna tablets show that at that time Philistia, Phœnicia and Palestine were practically one. The whole country was in a state of vassalage to Egypt, but the inhabitants were in a state of flux, and a cult planted at Gaza might easily spread to other parts of Syria.

III. WAS ILU EVER A DISTINCT DEITY IN BABYLONIA?


George Rawlinson in his *Five Great Monarchies* (I. 112sq.) and *The Religions of the Ancient World* (pp. 37, 38) held that there was at the head of the Babylonian pantheon a deity Il, or Ra. His sources of information were, however, not trustworthy. He relied on imperfect translations in the *Records of the Past*, on Greek sources of a late date, and on Egyptian analogies which were really quite remote. Schrader in his *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (ed. 2, p. 11) indicates that he holds the same view, or did hold it in 1883. On the other hand, Tiele in his *Histoire Comparée des Anciennes Religions* (pp. 181, 182) denies the existence of such a deity; Professor Lyon of Harvard in a paper in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, May 1883, makes a clear and forcible argument against it, and more recent works omit, I believe, all mention of such a deity.

The present note is written for the purpose of calling attention to a possible explanation of Ilu as an element of proper names, different from that adopted by Professor Lyon. He says (*op. cit.*, p. clxvii.): "The result of an examination of proper names containing *ilu* would be to show that this word does not represent a particular deity, but simply 'god,' as we saw above in the case of Bab-ilu, 'Babylon.' This is not saying that *ilu* would be the same god in each case. Zikar-ilu, for instance, 'Servant of ilu,' might mean servant of Ašûr, servant of Marduk, servant of Bêl, according to the preferences of the family in conferring the name."

Such an explanation is indeed possible, but is it the only one? In the tablets from the first Babylonian dynasty published by Meissner in his *Beiträge zum Altbabylonische Privatrecht*, 1893, there are several names compounded with Ilu. Ilu-šu-ib-ni (No. 4), Buni-Ilu (No. 12), Gi-mil-Ili (Nos. 14 and 59), Šum-ma-Ili (No. 20), Ilu-ikīša (No. 25), Ilu-šu-nu-ti (No. 30), Ilu-šu-ba-ni (No. 31), Pur-Ili (No. 35), Ilu-emuḫi (No. 38), Nur-Ili (No. 39), Mutu-Ili (No. 80), Ilu-išmi-ḫani (No. 97), Apil-Ili (No. 102), Ilu-kaša and Ilu-matiša (No. 105). In addition to these I have recently observed the following names on unpublished tablets belonging to the University of Pennsylvania: Marduk*-nu-uḫ-libbi-Ili, Ipi-iš-Ili,† and Izizu-itti-Ili.

* The tablet is partially defaced at this point, so that the reading is doubtful.

† Found also in Moldenke's *Cuneiform Texts*, No. 22.

In some of the names of this list *Ilu* is no doubt the generic term. Such is the case in *Ilu-šu-ib-ni* = 'His god created'; so also *Ilu-šu-nu-ti*, which is probably an abbreviation from a name originally longer. *Ilu-iḫiṣa* is, however exactly parallel to *Sin-iḫiṣa* (Meissner, No. 81), and *Bêl-iḫiṣa* (Moldenke, *op. cit.* No. 16), and while Lyon's explanation may possibly be the correct one, nevertheless a strong argument from analogy could be made to support the supposition that in this class of names *Ilu* was once as much a deity as *Sin* or *Bêl* was. *Iṣtar* was used both for "goddess" and for the name of a specific deity, and why should we not suppose that the development of this word was parallel to *Ilu*? We may, I think, take it for granted that in the evolution of ideas terms which afterwards were employed to designate genera were first the names of specific objects. The usage in the case of the word *Iṣtar* denotes an arrested development of this sort—a development arrested so early that *Iṣtar* is usually a specific deity, and only in rare cases the generic term. Do we not find here some ground for supposing that *Ilu*, the masculine term, is analogous—that it was once a specific deity, and that while it was such, names like *Ilu-emuḫi*, *Ilu-iḫiṣa*, *Nur-Ili*, and *Apil-Ili* were formed and became traditional? The argument from the analogies already mentioned is strengthened by the fact that among the Hebrews or Canaanites  was in early times a distinct deity.*

All these analogies lead me to suspect that *Ilu* was once a specific deity and underwent a transformation like that, the beginning of which we can trace in *Iṣtar*, only that in the case of *Ilu* the change went so far that almost every vestige of the specific use of the term was lost.

In the names given in Meissner's *Beiträge* the determinative is not prefixed to *Ilu*. This tends to show that the term had become, in these names, conventional, and that the consciousness of the presence of a specific deity in them had passed away. I am led, nevertheless, from the cumulative parallels here presented, to suspect that among the very early Babylonians *Ilu* was a distinct deity and that other names had in the historical period displaced it, as *Athtar* was before the historical period displaced in North Arabia.†

* Cf. *Oriental Studies* of the Oriental Club of Phila. Boston : Ginn & Co., 1894, pp. 97, 98.

† Cf. *HEBRAICA*, Vol. X., p. 66.

➤BOOK ♦NOTICES.♦◀

ERMAN'S EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR.*

This little book marks an era in the study of Egyptian. Small as it is, in it there is presented for the first time a statement of Egyptian grammar that can be called in any degree complete. To go further, it might even be said that here we have for the first time a grammar of Egyptian. This may seem strange to the reader who knows that Egyptian has been before the world, and has been studied for nearly a century, but yet the fact stands so, and those few books which could in any way dispute the claim of this to be the first grammar of Egyptian are by the same author and mark the stages of his gradual advance, and of the gradual advance with him of the scientific study of the language. In 1878 appeared Dr. Erman's *Pluralbildung*, in 1880 his *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, in 1889 his *Sprache des Papyrus Westcar*, a masterly development of the grammatical phenomena of a text which was published a year later in an equally masterly edition.

In fact, the treatment of this one papyrus, with its photographic reproductions (only those who have had to do with such things know how much here depends on the care of the editor whether they are to be for ornament or to the purpose), its elaborate palæographic *Feststellung* of the text, its glossary and grammatical analysis with the special grammar mentioned above, would have sufficed to show that Egyptian had at last fallen into hands that were prepared to rescue it from the reproach of dilettantism which had so long clung to it. And now, in this grammar, we have the ripened fruits of Dr. Erman's studies, an elaborated and rounded scheme of Egyptian that, however incomplete it may still be, is miles in advance of anything attempted up till now. It may safely be said that there is not another man alive who could have written this book, and, probably, those who can wade through it without having their ideas upon Egyptian simply transformed, can be counted on the fingers. Outside of Dr. Erman's Egyptological school at Berlin and the two or three English students who are working upon his lines in London, this book might be a revelation to the so-called Egyptologists, a class in which there is probably more amateurism, unscholarly habits and simple humbug than in any other branch of orientalism—and that is saying a good deal. It *might* be a revelation to such men, but the probability is that for them it will pass unheeded, and we shall continue for a few years to have texts published by editors who could not translate them to save their lives, and learned treatises upon the Exodus or upon Joseph in Egypt by men who take as their guides Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs* and Brugsch's *Egypt under the Pharaohs*. In truth, it is hard to insist too much upon the difference between the two schools, that which Erman has been working some twenty years to found, and that which is represented by almost all the older Egyptologists. On the one

* EGYPTIAN GRAMMAR, with Table of Signs, Bibliography, Exercises for Reading and Glossary by Adolf Erman. Translated by James Henry Breasted. *Williams & Norgate*, 1894.

hand, we have conjecture and the treatment of the results of conjecture as ascertained facts, raised to a science; on the other, a resolute declinature to treat as fact what is not fact, and to go a step beyond what is firm and certain. On the one hand, again, an attempt to translate everything and anything though half the words are unknown and the construction a mystery, sometimes rising to the bold declaration that there is no such thing in Egyptian as construction, and that grammars are needless; and on the other, a recognition that where there is language there must be grammar, and that it is no disgrace to confess that a sentence or a whole document is unintelligible, that the disgrace rather lies in professing to translate what one does not understand.

From what has now been said, it will be evident that this book, though it is one of the *Porta linguarum orientalium*, yet stands upon a very different level from that occupied by the other volumes of the same series. They form more or less excellent introductions to the different oriental languages, containing nothing but the universally known and recognized elements, and their chief merit is that they embrace in a small bulk a grammar, chrestomathy and glossary, and a guide for further study in the sketch of literature. These advantages this book also has, and the beginner may start with it in the full confidence that he will find in it all that he needs for the first few months of study. But, besides that, this book is simply the most complete and accurate statement of Egyptian grammar that has yet been published, and there is probably not an Egyptologist alive who will not have to make it a desk-book for constant reference. Two prefaces, the one by the author, the other by the translator, and full tables of contents and abbreviations occupy pp. I.-XV. Then the Grammar begins. Introduction, Orthography and Phonetics pp. 1-28, Pronouns pp. 28-36, Nouns pp. 36-62, Verbs pp. 62-124, Particles pp. 124-138, the Sentence pp. 138-171. Then comes a most valuable table of signs with the latest determinations pp. 172-194, and Bibliography pp. 195-201. Then, on a separate pagination, the exercises for reading pp. 1*-41*, and a glossary, which excites the hope that the dictionary on which Dr. Erman is at work, may soon appear, pp. 42*-70*.

It is impossible to enter into all the points of interest which are raised by this little book, but it may well be asked how it happens that only now are we approaching a grammatical treatment of the language. The only answer is to refer to the tremendous difficulties involved, and these difficulties come under the two heads of the orthography and the history of the language. As to orthography, every one is familiar with the appearance of Egyptian hieroglyphics, but it is only recently that it has been thoroughly realized that these signs, with the exception of one or two doubtful endings, are exclusively consonantal and that the vowels are never indicated. In this respect Egyptian agrees with the other Semitic languages, only in it the non-writing of the vowels is much more rigorously carried out. Evidently that law of Semitic phonology which makes the consonants of primary and the vowels of very secondary importance, was here in full force.

Again, as to the history of the language, it should be remembered that the oldest monuments date back to, at least, 3000 B. C., and that it only became extinct with the last speakers of Coptic, two or three hundred years ago. It is in the services of the Coptic church, still read in this which may be called "modern" Egyptian, that we meet the last remains of the language of the builders of the Pyramids. This long history is divided into the following five periods:—I. Old

Egyptian, the language of the old Empire, found in its oldest form in the Pyramid texts, and continuing long as the language of the learned, though as unintelligible to the common people as are our Latin inscriptions. II. Middle Egyptian, the language of the people during the Middle Empire. III. Late Egyptian, the popular language during the New Empire. IV. Demotic, the popular language of the immediately pre-Christian centuries, written in a curious cursive development of the Hieratic character. V. Coptic, the language of the Christians in Egypt, written in Greek characters. It is difficult to overestimate the changes which a history of this length must have involved. Between Vergil and Dante there are only some thirteen centuries, and between Alfred the Great and Tennyson, not ten, but the ability to read the "*Æneid*" or the "*Idylls of the King*" does not by any means involve the ability to read the "*Divina Commedia*," or Alfred's translation of Boëtius. And when to that is added that only in Coptic, the last of the five developments, are the vowels indicated, it will be understood how almost hopeless is the attempt to gain any knowledge of the word structure of old Egyptian. Dr. Erman puts the matter thus in the *Vorrede* to his *Sprache des Papyrus Westcar*, a text which appears to fall between the Middle and the New Empire:—"Wir stehen daher den vocallos geschriebenen Formen der alten Sprache fast hilflos gegenüber und können nur schwer oder gar nicht uns ein Urtheil darüber bilden, wie viel vokalisches geschiedene Formen sich hinter den äusserlich gleichen Consonantengruppen verbergen. Um sich unsere Lage zu veranschaulichen, denke man sich dass wir vom Syrischen nur einige alte unvokalisirte Texte besässen und dass wir nun die Formenlehre derselben mit alleiniger Hülfe des heutigen Neusyrischen enträthseln müssten, das, ganz ähnlich wie das Koptische von der alten reichen Flexion nichts gerettet hat als den Imperativ, zwei Participien und einen Infinitiv." But the difficulty of the case might have been stated even more strongly, for while in Syriac we have letters of prolongation that would go far to indicate the forms, these in Egyptian are totally lacking.

The comparison here made between Egyptian and Syriac suggests the question of their linguistic relationships, and this question is answered without doubt or hesitation by the first sentence of the Grammar. "The Egyptian language is related to the Semitic languages (Hebrew, Arabic, Aramaic, etc.), to the East African languages (Bischari, Galla, Somali, and others), and to the Berber languages of North Africa." Here we touch the second side of interest in this book. It is epoch making with regard to Egyptian, but it also marks the beginning of a new era in the study of comparative Semitic. Though Dr. Erman, apart from the above dogmatic statement, restrains himself in the most severe fashion from any dealing with these questions, it is principally due to him and his work that the place of Egyptian in the Semitic family can now be discussed without the risk of being regarded as a "crank" in the field of scholarship. Not many years ago that was the reputation that awaited the investigator—though in Egyptian where there were and are so many "cranks," that did not count for much—and it awaited him rightly, for our knowledge of Egyptian was not then upon such a basis of certainty, nor of such an extent as to facts, as to warrant any attempt at comparison with another language. But now, that is past, and though there is much that will have to be learned and unlearned, we have reached a position from which we can see how great is the part to be played by Egyptian in the study of the development of the Semitic group. That it is Semitic, no doubt now

remains and when Dr. Steindorff has completed his investigations into the sound-interchanges between Egyptian and Asiatic Semitic, we shall be able to compare the vocabularies of the two at length. But at the grammatical structure it is already possible to work, and it may be said without hesitation that the next great step in the study of comparative Semitic will be made through Egyptian. It will take us further back than we have yet been able to penetrate, and it will solve the riddle of the comparative values of Arabic and Hebrew as to primitiveness of form. Until recently it was imagined that we had in Arabic a tolerable representative of that mother tongue which lies behind the Semitic group, and Hebrew grammars, notably that of Olshausen, were written upon the principle of taking the Arabic form as representing the primitive, and from it deducing the Hebrew. This was an outcome of the position of the Dutch school of Arabists, and finds its parallel in the similar place once assigned to Sanscrit in the Indo-European group. But that passed, and it is coming to be slowly recognized that there are innumerable forms in Arabic which cannot be primitive, but are secondary in the highest degree; and, further, that the appearance of uniformity, which in Arabic is so striking and gives so strong an impression of originality, is due to a law of analogy working within this one language. Thus the pendulum has swung back and Hebrew has partly regained its place. The position of being the original language is not again claimed for it, but it may *possibly* be the most original in the Semitic group. The problem, then, was and is to decide how much in Arabic is primitive, and how much is due to analogy and changes in the language itself. To the solution of this problem Assyrian did not contribute as much as was expected. Perhaps its time has not yet come, but it may be said that students of Semitic are, from various causes, very chary of basing anything upon the evidence of Assyrian forms or texts. But now Egyptian has entered the field and has given promise of very different results. It stands very much farther removed from the other Semitic dialects than does Assyrian. The laws of the interchange of sounds show us that Assyrian is a close relative to Canaanite, and, as we now know through the Panammu inscription, to old Aramaic. But Egyptian stands altogether outside of the Asiatic group which forms a connected whole over against it. The combination of the two will take us behind the division, not only of Canaanite, Aramaic and Assyrian, or of North and South Arabic, but the division of North and South Semitic. Nay, it takes us even further than this, and promises to solve the problem of the North and East African languages. Into this it is impossible to enter, and many years must pass before, on that side, fixed results can be looked for, but it is curious to see the little group of languages called Semitic which were once regarded as being so sharply and decisively separated from all the other tongues of the earth, beginning to accept new members and to melt into an unknown haze.

But apart from the wider horizon which thus opens out, no one can work through this book without recognizing on almost every page the promise of the solution of one or another problem as to the origin of a form or of a construction. It is needless to enter into detail; no one who professes to study comparative Semitic can now afford to be ignorant of Egyptian, and those who, like Hommel in his examination of the Sibilants, have already begun the study, will be the leaders in the new movement. Like Hommel again, their theories may have been scoffed at, but it will be for the future to weed out the false from the true.

It is for the student of Semitic, then, to give his days and nights to the study of this grammar, and of the companion Coptic grammar by Dr. Steindorff, and thus, at last, to gain a basis for scientific comparative study. As a guide to this, Dr. Erman's article in Vol. XLVI. of the ZDMG., *Das Verhältniss des Aegyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen*, sums up all that at present can be asserted with absolute confidence.

It remains only to say that the translation, with the exception of the author's preface, which must have been done very hurriedly at the last, is idiomatic and careful, written in English and not, as so often, in English German. Mr. Breasted is to be congratulated on his work.

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD,

Hartford Theological Seminary.

A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF THE ASSYRIAN LANGUAGE.*

The facts connected with the history of the decipherment of the Assyrian language have compelled every student of Assyriology to be his own lexicographer. Every earnest student has compiled "lists" of words for his own use. This was the only way in which he could hope to keep pace with the rapidly increasing vocabulary and the only means by which he could attain to approximate or scientific accuracy in the definition and derivation of words and in the syntactical constructions of the language. From this necessity the real student is not likely soon to be relieved. Heaps of clay tablets are now being exhumed in the orient, and several of our museums contain a wealth of material for future investigation that is far from exhausted. For the specialist it matters little whether a Lexicon appears or not. But the case is different with the average graduate student who wishes to gain a practical working knowledge of the language—sufficient to enable him to follow and appreciate the work of specialists and intelligently apply their conclusions in other fields. For beginners in Assyrian it would be a great gain if a suitable compendium of the lexical results already achieved were at hand. Up to the present no complete work of this nature has appeared. Edwin Norris' *Assyrian Dictionary*, Parts I.–III., appeared a quarter of a century ago. It remained incomplete. The advance made in the whole field of Assyriology since 1872 has deprived his pioneer work in Assyrian lexicography of its value except as an historical landmark. Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch began the publication of his *Assyrisches Wörterbuch* in 1887. This work is beyond the range of the ordinary student in the wealth of material which it offers, and in the learned discussions of difficult points which enrich it, as well as in price. Moreover, at the present rate of publication the end is afar off.† Pater Strassmaier's *Verzeichniss Assyrischen und Akkadischen Wörter*, one of the most indispensable works for advanced students, is, as its title implies, a catalogue of words with their contexts alphabetically arranged and without definition. The most important available lexical contributions have come to us in connection with the interpreta-

* A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF THE ASSYRIAN LANGUAGE (Assyrian-English-German), by W. Muss-Arnolt. Part I., 8°, pp. 64. To be completed in about 8 parts. 5s. each. Berlin: Reuther u. Richard, 1894.

† His smaller *Wörterbuch* is, however, rapidly coming from the press, and is well adapted to the needs of students. April 10.

tion of special texts, or works on special subjects, but these, for the most part, like the works just named, are not available to the student who is beginning his study.

The feeling has been generally shared for several years that the time had come for a succinct Assyrian Dictionary, and Assyriologists generally, I believe, hailed with satisfaction the announcement issued by the "Semitic Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University" in 1887, of its intention to produce such a work. This intention, for some reason, has not been effected. On March 15th, 1892, in answer to an enquiry of the writer, Prof. Haupt wrote: "About one-quarter of the MS. has been prepared, and we hope to be able to begin with the printing in about two years." The present work, as we learn from this statement, as well as from the preface, owes its inception to the Semitic Department of Johns Hopkins University, and the author claims "that, on the whole, the plan is the same as that proposed by the 'Semitic Seminary.'" Prof. Haupt has already confirmed this in the *PAOS.* in which he points out that even parts of the preface are a transcript of what had been written regarding the plan before the author became a member of the Seminary. The author, after his connection with the "Seminary" as scribe and contributor in this coöperative undertaking, presumably had an accurate register of the results, and the inference may be legitimately drawn that this *First Part* agrees substantially with the beginning of the MS., one-quarter of which was ready for publication in 1892.

The work is therefore essentially a Johns Hopkins' production, and the credit of the work, as far as it has gone, must be divided between the author and his friend in Baltimore. It was in pursuance of the advice of Prof. Haupt, according to the preface, that the work has eventually appeared. We need not further concern ourselves with the history of this work of many hands, concerning which there seems to have been some "confusion of tongues" which resulted in the abandonment of the original purpose. Prof. Haupt has already promised to review it from the historical side, and we may safely leave the less interesting details of its origin and growth to him.

The industry of the author is in many respects certainly praiseworthy. We have here a collection of material sufficient to show to one engaged in any similar undertaking in this field the laborious character of the work. It is, therefore, with the greatest regret that I cannot welcome this work as one worthy of its author and equal to the needs of the student and to the demands of present-day Assyrian lexicography. Especially in this field, where the band of workers is yet small and the hindrances still many, all earnest effort ought to be met with encouragement. But, when an author enters into one of the most important fields and essays to furnish a guide-book for the uninitiated, he voluntarily assumes a function the performance of which cannot, in the interests of scholarship, be judged except by scientific standards.

What purports to be a favorable review of the book has already appeared in the *Academy* from the pen of Professor Sayce. Professor Sayce there declares that he "has nothing but words of warm welcome and admiration for Dr. Muss-Arnolt"; but immediately preceding he writes: "I wish that the author had been more careful in distinguishing Assyrian and Sumerian, and both from ideographic expressions. As it is, Sumerian and Assyrian are mixed together in a way that will be confusing to the beginner and still more to the general student of language." Later he adds: "The author has produced an accurate

work and achieved the object at which he aimed." We need not halt at this point to attempt a reconciliation of these antithetical judgments, nor to enquire what their author conceived the aim to be. We have reasons, as urgent perhaps as Mr. Sayce's, for expressing admiration of the author, yet we cannot unite with him in saying that he has produced "an accurate work." Much less has he produced such a work as we need.

1. The author, as we think, very unwisely accepted the suggestion of his publishers and added throughout translations into German. *Cui bono?* He has thus encumbered his work with useless repetitions, introduced confusion by the insertion of about thirty pairs of unsightly brackets on each page, enlarged the volume and increased the price of the work. The distraction occasioned by the brackets is all the greater as there is also a copious use of parentheses, parallel lines, etc. Judging from experience, it is a mistake to suppose that Germans who study Assyrian, or any Semitic language, are so entirely ignorant of English as to be in need of this proffered help. If the student wishes to prosecute his studies to any length, it is imperative that he learn English. The *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* admits articles in German, English, French, Italian and Latin, and the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* are printed for the most part in English and French, not to speak of HEBRAICA and others, to all of which the student is constantly referred. It must be quite evident to one who thinks over the matter seriously that the author has acted hastily and inconsistently.

2. The need of the present is a concise Dictionary in fact, not merely in name. Instead of that, the author has produced a combination of Dictionary and etymological reference book, a product, the origin of which, we fear, is to be sought in a vain and jealous conceit. Whatever value or interest may attach to the history of derivations and definitions, the attention of the student certainly ought not to be diverted from the point in hand, viz., the definition and derivation. It is sufficient to insert them, and, if doubtful, mark them so. To take the first case that my eye happens to catch at the moment, the word *abbûnu*, p. 9, written *ab-bu-un-nu* and defined "perhaps, pelican." It is said to be parallel, or equal, to *tušmû*, and reference is made to *Ds118=Delitzsch, Assyrische Studien*. Both words are there defined as "Pelekan." *Abbûnu* is derived from

حِينَ IV. "aufblasen," and *tušmû* from נָשַׁם, "aufblasen," and said to be the same as תְּנִשְׁמַת. Turning back to page 93 *ibid.*, where three pages are given to the discussion of *tušmû*, he reads convincing arguments in favor of the reading, definition and derivation of *tušmû*. Then he has a reference to *DW.* (no page!) a work thirteen years later. Here he finds no reference whatever to *tušmû*. On the contrary, *ab-bu-un-nu* is equated with *ku-mu-u*, as Norris, II. 567, had previously read. Moreover, *DW.* reads *ab-bu-un-nu* (or *ap-pu-un-nu*?) and defines "ein Vogel" with no attempt at derivation. In remark 2, we read: "Für einen anderen Vogel *kumû* nämlich den Pelekan, s. u. *atân nâri*, 'Flusseselin.'" There are still two other references, viz., Jensen and *AV.* 77. He looks back to the list of "Abbreviations" to see what work of Jensen's is intended. Reference to the page is wanting, so he turns to the Glossary of *Kosm.*, only to find that the word *kumû* is not recorded (only *kummu*.) *AV.* is now turned to, and here he sees that *ab-bu-un-nu* is equated with *ku-mu-u* and defined "ein Vogel." It is further compared with Aram. אֲבִינָה "Weihe?" (?) and Heb. אֲנִיָּה. How much now has the student

gained, or what is to be gained by anyone by spending time on these clever speculations which have been abandoned long ago by the authors? In our own private "lists," these references are indispensable; here they have no place. It is the business of the lexicographer not merely to collect his material, he is also required to express a judgment. The student here is left to himself to find out that Prof. Delitzsch no longer defines the word in question as "Pelekan," and that he does not propose for it the derivation given in *Assyrische Studien*. He is left to draw what conclusion he may as to the correctness of Pater Strassmaier's identification of the word with אֲבִינִיתָ and אֲנָפָה. If he concludes that the latter is correct, he may chance to look down the column to the word *ibnetum*. This is defined as "fishhawk," and this, too, he learns is "perhaps" to be compared with Aram. אֲבִינִיתָ. There is a reference to Ds114, where it is defined as "Fischreiher" (?) but there is no mention of DW. which omits "Fischreiher (?)" but says, "*sicher* = targ. אֲבִינִיתָ womit hebr. אֲנָפָה widergegeben wird." We submit as our judgment that the student has had unwisely imposed upon him a vast amount of labor, the result of which must be confusion and distrust. Would it not have been preferable to have stated simply that *ab-bu-un-nu* = *ku(tuš)-mu-u*, a bird; *ibnetu* = *dûdu*, a bird; cf. Aram. אֲבִינִיתָ, Heb. אֲנָפָה? These examples, taken by chance, indicate what I conceive to be a grievous mistake in a work intended for the beginner.

3. The author seems to have forgotten the promise of the preface to give "the corresponding forms" occurring "in the sister idioms." The insertion of these forms, especially the Hebrew, instead of the diverting translations into German, would have been highly profitable. This, however, has been done with a reserve that caricatures the promise. Does the stem *abâru*, p. 9, not correspond to חָבַר; and is not the root *ṭaṭâpu* given under this word as a synonym, the same root which occurs in טֹטְפֹר, Aram. טֹטְפָא? Have the following forms on pp. 7-9, not to speak of others, no corresponding forms "in the sister idioms"? *ebru* (2), *abru* (1), *abusu*, *ebru* (3), *abnu*, *abalu* (1), *ablu* (2), *abûlu*, *ubanu*, (according to the derivation preferred)? Why explain *almattu* (3), "widow=vidua," and leave out אֶלְמָנָה?

4. The work gives evidence on almost every page of inaccuracies and scorn of scientific principles. The first sentence in the book is a blunder. The student is informed that the Assyrian 𐎶 represents *seven gutturals*, two of which are the labial *waw* and the palatal *yodh*! If we look now at the first word, A₁ 1. we ask (a) Why it is not written *Ā*? (b) Why, when it is defined "ah!" it were not better to translate it so in the appended example? The translation given does not represent the Assyrian (though, see also ZB. and DW.), and is decidedly un-English. (c) Why in this example *šunuḥat* (sighs, cf. 𐎶𐎵𐎶𐎶) is translated "is filled" (= *tumtalli* or *malat*)? (d) Why *kabitti* is written *kat-bit-ti*? (e) What new light has the author obtained on the text that he should prefer *kabitti* to *kabittašu*, as read by Zimmern BS. p. 10 and Delitzsch AW. p. 218? IV R² p. 29 certainly furnishes none. The last two lines of the Rev. were like those of the Obv. doubtlessly spoken by the priest. The last line certainly was, as is clear from the non-Semitic IŠ-BI and the Assyrian *i-bak-ki*. Turning to p. 2 to *a-u*, we are told that it is written *ja-u*,

II. 33, 785. But the ja-u there is an adverb and synonym of ja-nu (with which it is equated) = where = יָן . Reference is made to IV R. 68, 11 + 16 for the pl. a-a-u-te. The sentence (l. 16) reads âûte dibbêya ša akka-bakáni ina muhhi la tazizûni (=tanzizûni) = *What (are) my words* which I have spoken to thee whereon thou hast not relied? âûte dibbêya cannot mean "what words." The word does not occur in l. 11. The citation of NE. 43, 42f. without an accompanying interrogation was, to say the least, venturesome. It is quite impossible to decide from the fragmentary lines a-a-ú ħa mí ra ana da-riš, and a-a-ú al la ki i-lu-ú what the force of the word is, much less to translate it "what has become of?"

5. Principles seem to have been utterly ignored in indicating the length of the vowels. The a of âbu is certainly long, and not short as given, as examples like a-a-bu, ab-bu show and as the derivation (אֲבָהָא), if correct, would suggest. The pl. is âbê, not "abe," though two lines below we read abêšu, and again abêia followed by "šarrani." Under âbu, we read pl. abuti, c. st. abût. So abubu for abûbu, abubaniš for abûbâniš, abul-lati (sic!) for abûlâti. (Why the -ia after the MEŠ?) Why read abûlâti? The word is construed as a *feminine*, but this does not prove that the pl. ending is "âti." The citation(s) should have been given for the form, as the common reading is abullê. Under "ubanu" (for ubânu), we read side by side "ubane," "ubanât," "ĥuršane," "šadê." So "eburu" 3, but note "ebûru," "abâlu," and "abalu," "abkulû" and "abkûlû," "abšanû" and "ab-šā-na." These are not selected pages, and it is, therefore, sufficient to add: *Ex his disce omnia!*

6. Instead of the symbols Q, I, Q^m, ŠT, etc., it would have been much better had the author accepted the common notation I.₁, II.₁, I.₃, III.₂, etc. And to what purpose are the devices, so generally ignored in Assyrian works and by Assyriologists, of representing 𐎶 by X (x) and 𐎶 by ç introduced here? Such things are too petty for notice, were it not that they serve only to confuse the student, and represent a local striving after *novas res*.

7. What advantage is gained by distiguring the pages with the mathematical signs >, ∞, the first of which ordinarily denotes "greater than," the second the difference undetermined between two quantities? The use of the latter is not explained in the List of Abbreviations. The simple contraction "fr." or the usual "=" for the former and the omission of the latter would have been preferable. Symbols have their place, when they have a special use and excel in clearness or brevity the ordinary contractions, not otherwise.

8. Occasionally the author reverses the order "Ass.-Eng.-Germ." and gives the Germ. the preference. Cf. p. 7, col. 1, under ubbulu, 1. "ob magere Getreide wächst, whether poor grain will thrive;" Col. II., l. 4, "er nahm weg, he took away;" and p. 11, under abšenu, "Korn in Aehren" is left untranslated; "die Weltgegenden," *ibid.*, col. 1, l. 5, likewise. Not infrequently the translations from German into English are ambiguous and infelicitous, e. g., "Rain-gushes" from Regengüsse, p. 3, "To make half the royal cap," from die Königsmütze zu hälften, s. agu 2. p. 20, "gathered blood" from geronnenes Blut.

9. Wherever the plurs. of nouns or adjectives occur, they should have been placed immediately after the singular. The author's arrangement leaves the

student uninformed until he has read the most, if not all, that is given on the word. The verb-stems likewise should have been indicated more clearly than they are. If the common notation had been employed and projected beyond the edge of the column, a much more serviceable book would have been the result.

10. The criticism made by Professor Sayce on the lack of discrimination between Sumerian and Assyrian is a just one. No suggestion is made anywhere that such words as *agubbu* (*a* + *gub*), *igegallu* (*ige*-*gal*), *edamukku* (*a* + *damug*), etc., were not originally pure Semitic. Enough said.

I have not attempted a thorough examination of the work. I say nothing whatever about the etymologies or the definitions, nor about the typographical errors of which there are too many. What I have said is wholly without prejudice, but not without a very strong conviction that this book will not satisfy our needs unless it be reconstructed on wholly different principles and executed with greater care. And we would most heartily recommend the author and publisher to take this suggestion into their consideration.

JAMES A. CRAIG.

University of Michigan, Dec. 26th.

Since writing the above, I have been informed that Part I. was withdrawn, soon after its appearance in America, on account of the numerous mistakes to which the author's attention was directed. Within a week a new edition of Part I. has appeared with the following explanation: "Owing to the great distance between Leipzig(!) and Chicago, the author could read only one proof of the greater portion of Part I. This has caused a number of irregularities in the marking of quantities, etc. Part I. has therefore been printed again."

April 10th, 1895.

J. A. C.

❖SEMITIC❖BIBLIOGRAPHY.❖

GENERAL.

- Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'histoire ancienne. Edited by J. Halévy. First year, 1893, Numbers for July and October. Paris: Leroux.....Fr. 20.
- HALÉVY, J. Notes. *Journal Asiatique*. Sér. VIII. Tome XIX., pp. 564-66.
- LINDBERG, O. E. Studier öfver de semitiska ljuden w och y. Lund, 1893 (Diss.), pp. 176.
- LUSCHAN, F. v. Altorientalische Fibeln. *Zeitsch. f. Ethnol.*, XXV., pp. 387-89.
- NESTLE, E. Three small contributions to Semitic Palæography. *Trans. of Intern. Orient. Congress at London, 1892*. Vol. II., p. 62sq.
- SAYCE, A. H. The Aramæan inscriptions of Sinjerli and the name of the Jews. *Academy*, Vol. XLIV., p. 16.
- VOGÜÉ, MARQUIS DE. Fouilles du comité oriental allemand à Sendjirli (Haute Syrie). *Acad. inscrip. et belles-lettres: Compte Rendu*, 4th Sér. Tome XXI., p. 15.

ASSYRIAN.

- ADAMS, W. M. Note on the Babylonian Calendar. *B. and O. Record*, Vol. VII., p. 66sq.
- BELCK, W. and C. F. Lehmann. Ueber die Kelishin-Stein. *Zeitsch. f. Ethnol.*, Vol. XXV., pp. 389-400.
- BEZOLD, C. Fragment einer Inschrift Saosduchinos'. *ZA.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 392-94.
- BONAVIA, E. The Flora of the Assyrian Monuments and its Outcomes. London: *Constable*, 1893.....10s.
- The Sacred Trees of Assyria. *Trans. of Intern. Orient. Congress at London, 1892*, Vol. II., pp. 245-57.
- BOSCAWEN, W. ST. CHAD. The Discoveries at Tel-Loh. *Academy*, Vol. XLIV., p. 175sq.
- The oldest Dressmaker's Bill in the World. *St. James Gazette*, Dec. 3, 1893.
- Beginnings of Chaldean Civilization. *B. and O. Record*, Vol. VII., pp. 1-8; 25-30.
- BROWN, JR., ROBT. The Ten Patriarchs of Berossus. *Academy*, Vol. XLIV., p. 56.
- The Te Tablet. *Ibid.*, p. 395sq.

- CARA, CESARE DE. Identificazione d'Iside e d'Osiride con Ištar ed Ašur. *Actes VIII. Orient. Cong.* (Section sémit.), pp. 273-78.
- DELATTRE, A. J. La Correspondance asiatique d'Amenophis III. et d'Amenophis IV. *Revue Quest. Hist.*, Vol. LIV. (1893), pp. 353-88.
- HALÉVY, J. Le rapt de Perséphoné ou Proserpine par Pluton chez les Babyloniens. *Revue sémit.*, Vol. I., pp. 372-76.
- La royaume héréditaire de Cyrus. *Actes VIII. Orient. Cong.* (Sec. sémit.), pp. 153-63.
- HEUZÉY, LÉON. Le vase du patési Entena. *Compte Rendu*, Sér. IV., Tome XXI.
- La lance colossale d'Isdoubar et les nouvelles fouilles de M. de Sarzec. *Ibid.*, pp. 305-10.
- Le patési Entéména d'après les découvertes de M. de Sarzec. *Ibid.*, pp. 314-19.
- HILPRECHT, H. V. Serpent and Tree in Babylonian Records. *Sunday School Times*, No. 52, 1893.
- Zur Schreib. des Namens Šagarakti-Burias. *ZA.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 386-91.
- HOMMEL, F. Die Identität der ältesten babylonischen und ägyptischen Göttergenealogie und der babyl. Urspr'g d. ägypt. Cultur. *Trans. of Intern. Orient. Congress at London*, Vol. II., pp. 218-44.
- A supplementary note to Gibil-Gamish. *PSBA.*, Vol. XVI., pp. 13-15.
- JENSEN, P. Zu den zwei Inschriften Sarduri's des Ersten. *ZA.*, VIII., S. 375-81.
- KARKARIA, R. P. Assyrian relics from Nimrod in the possession of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. *Jour. Bomb. RAS.*, XVIII., pp. 97-108.
- KNUDTZON, J. A. Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott für Staat u. königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons u. Asurbanipals. Bd. I., Autographirte Texte III. u. 60 S. folio. Bd. II., Einleitung, Umschrift u. Erklärung, Verzeichnisse, XI. u. 339 S. 8vo, Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1893.....M. 40.

- LEHMANN, C. F. Das altbabyl. Maass- und Gewichtssystem als Grundlage der antiken Gewichts-, Münz- und Maasssysteme. *Actes VIII. Orient. Cong.* (Sect. sémit.), pp. 165-249, and a table.
- MAHLER, ED. Das Kalenderwesen der Babylonier. *Trans. of Intern. Orient. Congress at London, 1892*, Vol. II., pp. 209-17.
- MEISSNER, B. Zu ZA., VIII., S. 194 sqq., 382-4.
- MOOR, FL. de. Examen critique de quelques synchronismes assyrio-bibliques. *Muséon*, XII., pp. 382-400.
- NIKOLSKIJ, M. V. O dvuch assirijskich fragmentach knjazja P. A. Putjatina. *Drevnosti Vostočnyja I.*, pp. 353 sq.
- Klinoobraznyja nadpisi vanskich carej, otkrytyja v predělach Rossii. *Ibid.*, pp. 375-453.
- Klinoobraznaja nadpiš Rusy I. v Kólany-Kirlany (Alučalu) na beregu Gakč v Erievskoj gubernii. *Arch. Izv. i Zam., Imp. Mosk. Arch. Obsč. I.* (Moskva, 1893), pp. 433-7; also additional thereto; Tekst, transkripcija i perevod klinoobraznych nadpisej Kólany-Kirlany (Alučalu), No. XVIII. Armavir No. XIX. i XX., Sarykamyš No. XXI. i Zachalu No. XV. Moskva, 1893.
- OPPERT, JULES. La fondation consacrée à la déesse Ninā. *ZA.*, VIII., pp. 360-74.
- Le dernier roi de l'Assyrie. *Compte Rendu, Sér. IV.*, Tome XX., pp. 402 sq.
- Le canon des dates babyloniennes. *Ibid.*, pp. 410-15.
- Le champ sacré de la déesse Ninā. *Ibid.*, pp. 326-44.
- PINCHES, T. G. A tablet referring to dues paid to the temple of the sun at Sippara. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, VIII., p. 190 sq.
- The new version of the Creation Story. *Trans. of Orient. Congress at London, 1892*, Vol. II., pp. 190-98.
- PRICE, IRA M. A new find in Chaldea. *Bib. World*, Vol. II., p. 132 sq.
- RASSAM, H. On the preservation of Assyrian and Babylonian Monuments. *Trans. Orient. Congress at London, 1892*, Vol. II., pp. 187-9.
- ROBIOU, F. A study on Egyptian and Babylonian triads. *Asiat. Quart. Review*, II. Ser., VII., 13 pp. 119-36.
- SAYCE, A. H. A bilingual Vannic and Assyrian Inscription. *Academy*, Vol. XLIV., p. 115 sq.
- Inaugural address [to the Semitic Sec.]. *Trans. of Orient. Congress at London, 1892*, Vol. II., pp. 169-86.
- SCHEIL, V. Une tablette palestinienne cuneiforme. *Recueil de Trav.*, XV., p. 137 sq.
- Inscription de Ramman-nirari Ier. *Ibid.*, pp. 138-40.
- Bas-relief avec inscription de Sennachérib. *Ibid.*, p. 148 sq.
- SIMPSON, WM. The Tower of Babel and the Birs-Nimroud. *TSBA.*, IX., pp. 307-32 and two tables.
- STRASSMAIER, J. N. Babylonische Texte, Heft. XI.: Inschriften von Darius, König von Babylon (521-483 v. Chr.) von den Thontafeln des Britischen Museums copirt und autographirt, Heft II., No. 249-451. von 9-17 regierungsjahre. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1893, pp. 161-320.....M. 12.
- Einige kleinere babylonische Keilschrifttexte aus dem Britischen Museum. *Actes VIII. Cong. Orient.* (Sec. sémit.) pp. 279-83, also 35 autograph pages of text and transcription.
- STRONG, S. A. A Prayer of Asurbanipal. *Trans. of Orient. Congress at London, 1892*, Vol. II., pp. 199-208.
- WILCKEN, U. Der šar kibrāt irbitti und der šar kiššati. *ZDMG.*, Bd. 47, pp. 710-14.
- WINCKLER, H. Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten. II. Texte verschiedenen Inhalts. 1-2 Lfg. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1893, pp. 1-76 (autog.).....M. 6; M. 8.
- ZEHNPfUND, R. Ueber baby.-Assyr. Tafelschreibg. *Actes VIII. Cong. Orient.* (Sec. sémit.), pp. 265-72.

ARAMAIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

- BAETHGEN, FRDR. Ueber eine im Orient vorhandene syrische Handschrift, etc. *Actes VIII. Cong. Orient.* (Sec. sémit.), pp. 107-16.
- BARNES, W. E. A Syriac MS. (Add. 17215) in British Museum. *Academy*, XLIV., p. 344.
- BEDJAN, P. Oeuvre des publication chaldeenes. *Oeuvres des Écoles d'Orient*, 1893, pp. 157-62.

- BERTHELOT, M. La chimie des l'antiquité et au moyen âge. I. Grecs, les Latins, les Syriens. II. Les Arabes. *Rev. d deux Mondes*, CXIX., pp. 315-36; 545-63.
- BRANDT, W. Mandäische Schriften übers. u. erklärt. Göttingen: *Vanderhoeck & Rup.*, 1893, pp. xx. and 232.....M. 8.
- CHABOT, J. B. La legende de Mar Bassus Texte syriaque, traduit et annoté, publié pour la première fois. Paris: *Leroux*, 1893, pp. xvi. and 72.
- CHASE, F. H. The old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae. London: *Macmillan*, 1893, pp. xvi. and 160.....7s. 6d. Reviews in *Acad.*, XLIV., p. 351 (Simcox, G. A.); *Athenaeum*, Oct. 21, 1893; *Scottish Rev.*, XXII., 44, p. 453.
- DRONIN, E. Inscriptions funéraires palmyreniennes. *Rev. sémi.*, I., pp. 270-2, and one table.
- GRIMME, HUB. Der Strophengebäude in den Gedichten Ephraems des Syrers. Freiburg (Schweiz), 1893, pp. viii. and 95.....M. 4.
- GUIDI, IGN. Un nuovo testo siriano sulla storia degli ultimi Sassanidi. *Attes VIII. Congr. Orient.* (Sec. sémi.), pp. 1-36.
- GWYNN, JNO. On a Syriac MS. of the N. T. in the library of the Earl of Crawford, etc. *Trans. of Royal Irish Acad.*, XXX., pp. 347-418.
- LAMBERT, M. De l'emploi du lamed en araméen biblique devant le complément direct. *Rev. Études juives*, XXVII., p. 269 sq.
- LEWIS, S. The Lectionaries at Mt. Sinai. *Athenaeum*, Oct. 23, 1893, p. 591.
- MACLEAN, A. J. Vernacular Syriac as spoken by the Eastern Syrians. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 33-34.
- MARSHALL, J. T. The Aramaic Gospel. Reply to Driver and Allen, *Expositor*, 1893, Sept., pp. 176-92. Reply of Driver, *Ibid.*, Nov., pp. 388-400; Dec., pp. 419-31.
- POGNON, H. Une inscription de Babylone en caractères araméens. *Rev. sémi.*, p. 273.
- SEEBERG, R. Der Apologet Aristides, u. s. w. Leipzig, 1893, pp. v. and 68.....M. 2.
- WOHLSTEIN, JOS. Ueber einige aramäische Inschriften auf Thongefässen des Könighchen Museums zu Berlin. *ZA.*, VIII., pp. 313-39.

HEBREW.

- BACHMANN, J. Tabellen zur hebräischen Grammatik. XI. Verbum mediae gutturalis; XII. Verb. tertiae gutt., XIII., Verba nähern, u. s. w., u. s. w. Berlin: *Mayer & Müller*, 1893, folio..M. 0.20 per part.
- BALL, C. J. An Elementary Grammar, with Intro. by R. F. Weidner. N. Y. and Chicago: *Revell & Co.*, 1893, pp. 423.....\$2.25.
- BALTZER, J. P. Deutsch-hebr. Wörterverzeichnis zu dem hebr. Uebungsbuch. Stuttgart, 1893, pp. 15.....M. 0.30.
- MARGOLIOUTH, G. The Superlinear punctuation, its origin, the different stages of its development, etc. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 46-56.
- MOLIN, O. Om propositionen ׀ i bibelhebreiskan. Upsala, 1893, pp. iii. and 65 (Diss.).
- NESTLE, E. Nigri, Boehm. u. Pelican. Ein Beitrag zur Anfangsgeschichte des hebr. Sprachstudiums in Deutschland. Tübingen, 1893, pp. 35 and 39 fskm.....M. 3.
- PRILL, JOS. Einführung in die hebr. Sprache f. den Schulgebrauch. Bonne, 1893, pp. x. and 153.....M. 2.
- ZERWECK, N. Die hebr. Präp. ׀. Leipzig, 1893, pp. 60.....M. 3.

ARABIA AND ARABIC.

GENERAL.

- BURTON, R. F. Personal Narrative of a pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Meccah. Ed. by his wife, Isabel Burton. Memorial ed., 2 vols. London, 1893.....12s.
- COWPER, H. S. Through Turkish Arabia: a journey from the Mediterranean to Bombay by the Euphrates and Tigris Valleys and Persian Gulf. London, 1893.....18s.
- DOLLFUS, L. Les Muzarabes. *Rev. hist. rel.*, XXVIII., pp. 111-34.
- GOLDZIEHER, I. La notion de la Sakina chez les Mohamétans. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-13.
- Ibn Hûd the Mohammedan Mystic, and the Jews of Damascus. *Jew. Quar. Rev.*, VI., 21, pp. 218-20.
- HAMID SNOW, W. R. Merits of Islâm or the primitive Faith. Lahore, 1893.
- HARRIS, W. B. A Journey through the Yemen, and some general remarks upon that Country. London, 1893.....16s.

- JACOB, G. Das Beduinleben im Lichte der Beduinpoesie. *Globus*, LXIV., pp. 363-6; 375-8.
- KREHL, L. Das islamische Dogma von der *Fitra*. *Festgruss Roth*, pp. 167-9.
- LAND, J. P. N. Remarks on the earliest development of Arabic music. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892. Vol. II., pp. 153-63.
- LANE-POOLE, S. The Mohammedan Dynasties, chron. and genealog. tables, with hist. introd. London, 1893.....12s.
- Études Orient. Système législatif musulman. Mariage. Par I. de Nauphal. Berlin, 1893.....M. 4.
- Études Orient. Législation musulmane. Filiation et divorce. Par I. de Nauphal. *Ibid.*, 1893.....M. 6.40.
- SCHWERN, H. H. v. Muhammedanismen i Afrika. Antropo-geogr. studie. Lund, 1892.....1 k. 8.
- WASHBURN, G. Christianity and Mohammedanism, their points of contact and contrast. *Contemp. Rev.*, Nov. 1893, pp. 654-69.
- WOLLASTON, A. N. Half-hours with Muhammad. New ed. London, 1893....3s. 6d.
- LANGUAGE.
- Die Hdschr. Verzeichn. d. Königl. Bibliothek z. Berlin. Bd. 17. Arab. Hdschr. v. W. Ahlwardt. Berlin, 1893.....M. 23.
- CODERA, FR. Libros árabes impresos en Túnez. *Bol. R. Acad. de la hist.*, XXIII., pp. 58-66.
- FAGNAN, E. Manuscrits de la bibliothèque-musée d'Alger. Paris, 1893.....Fr. 20.
- BOSSET, R. L'expédition du Châteaux d'or et le combat d'Ali contre le dragon. *Gl. soc. as. it.*, VII., pp. 3-81.
- Fragments de chansons populaires dans les Mille et une Nuits. *Rev. trad. pop.*, VIII., pp. 445-7.
- BOCKFORD, W. Vathek, an Arabian Tale. Ed. by R. Garnett, with notes by Sam. Henley, and etchings by Herb. Nye. London and N. Y., 1893.....21s.; \$7.50.
- CHERBONNEAU, A. Fables de Lokmân. Texte arabe, etc. Paris, 1893.....Fr. 1.50.
- CORANI TEXTUS ARABICUS.....addit by G. Flügel. Ed. ster. Tauchn. tertium emendata Nova. impressio. Leipzig, 1893..M.20.
- DERENBOURG, H. Ousâma Ibn Mounkidh. Un émir syrien au premier siècle des croisades (1095-1188). Paris, 1893.....Fr. 15.
- FISKE, WILLARD. Parole arabe disposte in ordine alfabetico (Arabic). Firenze, 1893.
- GEYER, R. Aus Al-Buhturî's Hamâsah. *ZDMG.*, Bd. 47, pp. 418-39.
- GOLDZIEHER, I. Sâlih b. 'Abd-al-Kuddûs u. d. Zindikthum während d. Regierung d. Chalfen Al-Mahdi. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 104-29.
- GREEN, A. O. Collection of modern Arabian stories, ballads, poems and proverbs. Oxford, 1892.3s. 6d.
- HIRSCHFELD, H. Prolegomena to an edition of the Divân of Hassân b. Thâbit. *Trans. Orient. Cong. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 99-103.
- HUART, CL. L'ode arabe d'Ochkonwân publiée, trad. et annotée. *Rev. sém.*, I., pp. 259-69; 337-58.
- JACOB, G. Studien in arab. Dichten. Heft I., Dr. L. Abel's neue Mu'allaqât-Ausgabe nachgeprüft. Berlin, 1893.....M. 2.80.
- JARRETT, H. S. Modern customs among the Bedouins of the Hauran, ed. and translated. *JRAS.*, LXII., III., pp. 47-94.
- LEWIS, MRS. Some ancient MSS. of the Arabic N. T. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 96-8.
- LIDZBARSKI, M. Zu den arab. Alexander geschichten. *ZA.*, VIII., pp. 263-312, 410.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. *Tainvós rîç*. *Philologus*, LII., p. 736.
- PERTSCH, W. Die arab. Uebersetzung des Amrtakunda. *Festgruss Roth*, pp. 208-12.
- RÉGLA, P. DE. Mahomedaansche theologie, El Ktab. Amsterdam, 1893.....Fr. 3.25.
- SÍBAWAIHI'S Buch üh. die Gram. nach der Ausg. von H. Derenbourg u. d. Commentar des Sirâfi übs. u. erkl. u. mit Auszügen aus Sirâfi u. anderen Commentaren versehen v. G. Jahn. ca 14 Lfgn. Berlin, 1894.a Lfg. M. 4.
- SOCIN, A. Zum arab. Dialekt von Marokko. *Abh. phil-hist. Cl. Sächs. Ges. Wiss.*, XIV., pp. 149-204.
- STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Die arab. Uebersetzungen aus den Griechischen. Leipzig, 1893.M. 5.
- THORNTON, F. DU PRÉ. Elementary Arabic text-book and glossary. London, 1893.2s. 6d.

- VAUX, C. DE. L'Almageste d'Abû'lwéfa Al-bûzdjâni. *J.A.*, Sér. VIII., T. XIX., pp. 408-71.
- VLOTEN, G. VAN. Dämonen, Geister u. Zauber bei den alten Arabern. *Wiener Zeits. f. Kunde des Morgenlandes*, VII., pp. 233-47.
- VOLLERS, K. The system of Arabic sounds, as based upon Sibawaihi and Ibn Yaish. *Trans. Orient. Congress at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 130-54.
-
- OLD TESTAMENT.
- Aidsto the Student of the Holy Bible. London: *Eyre & Spot.*, 1893.....5s.
- ALBERTZ, E. Die Bibel in der Kunst u. die Kunst in der Bibel. *Kirch. Monatschr.*, XIII., 2, pp. 79-94.
- ANDRÉ, T. L'esclavage chez les anciens Hébreux. *Étude d'arch. bibl.* Genève, 1893.3 fr.
- ASMUSSEN, P. Die zehn Stämme. *ZDPV.*, XVI., pp. 256-68.
- Die Leastämme. *Zeits. f. Wiss. Th.*, Bd. 36, II., pp. 378-415.
- BARUS, H. La Révélation du nom divin "Tétragrammaton." *Rev. bibl.*, 1893, 3, pp. 329-50.
- Die heilige Schrift des Alt. Test.; translated by Kautsch and others. Subsc.-Ausgabe in 10 Lfgn. Freiburg i. B., 1890-94.....M. 12.
- Das Alte Testament über eingel. u. erl. v. Ed. Reuss, etc. 5 Bde. Braunschweig, 1892-93.
- The Holy Bible—Old and New Tests. Edited by Cheyne, Driver, Clarke (R. L.), and Sanday (W.). London, 1893, *Eyre & Spot.*...12s. 6d.
- Biblia hebraica secundum editiones Ios. Athica, Ioa. Leusden, Io. Simonis aliorumque inprimis Everardi van der Hooght rec. Aug. Hahn. Ed. ster. C. Tauchnitii. Quantum recognita et emendata. Leipzig, 1893. M. 6.
- La sainte Bible. (Texte latin et trad. française). Commentée d'après la Vulgate et les textes originaux par L. Cl. Fillion. T. 4: Les Psaumes, les Proverbes, l'Ecclesiaste, le Cantique des cantiques. Paris, 1892.
- La sainte Bible, ou l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament, d'après la version revue par J. F. Ostervald. Nancy, 1893.
- BLEEK, F. Einleitung in das Alt. Test. 6 Aufl. besorgt von J. Wellhausen. Berlin, 1893.
- BLEICHER, C. Biblische u. Jüdische pragmatische Geschichte. Wien, 1893.
- BRANCO, W. Das angebliche Wrack der Arche Noas nach des Berosus u. ander. Mitt'gen. *Jahrhfte d. Vereins f. vaterl. Naturkde. in Württembg*, XLIX. (1893), pp. 21-32.
- BRANDES, G. La Bible et Homère. *Rev. des Rev.*, Dec., 1893.
- CONDER, C. R. The earliest ages of Hebrew History. *Scott. Review*, Vol. XXII., 44, pp. 274-92.
- CROOKER, J. H. The new Bible and its new Uses. Boston, 1893.....\$1.00.
- Plain Introsds. to Books of the Bible. I. Old Test. ed., by C. J. Ellicott. London: *Cassell*, 1893.....3s. 6d.
- FOURRIÈRE, —. Balaam et la mythologie. Paris, 1891.
- GASC-DESFOSSÉS. Les conférences de l'abbé de Broglie sur l'idée de Dieu des l'A. Testament. *Rev. de la sc. W.*, Dec., 1893.
- GIBBES, E. O. The Origin of Sin and dotted Words in the Hebrew Bible. N. Y., 1893.\$1.25.
- GIRARD, R. DE. Études de géologie biblique. Le déluge devant la critique historique. Fribourg, 1893.....M. 6.
- GOLDZIEHER, I. Ueber Bibelcitate in muhammedanischen Schriften. *ZATW.*, Bd. XIII., pp. 315-21.
- GRAU, R. F. Sem, Ham und Japhet. *Beweis des Glaubens*, Juli, 1893, pp. 249-64.
- HECHLER, W. H. An ancient papyrus MS. of the LXX. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 331-3.
- HERVEY, A. C. The Sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. *Expositor*, Dec., 1893, pp. 446-55.
- HÖHNE, E. Die Berührungspunkte zwischen Moses u. Plato.....zum theil nach Philo. Leipzig, 1893.....M. 0.80.
- LAMY, T. J. La Bible royale en cinq langues, imprimée par Plantin. *Bul. Ac. de Belgique*. Sér. III. T. XXIII., pp. 628-68.
- LETOURNEAU, CH. Origine de la circoncision chez les Juifs. *Bul. soc. d'Anthr. de Paris*, IV. Sér. IV., 5, p. 209 sq.
- MAASS, M. Bibel u. Koran, verglichen nach ihrem historisch-ethischen Gehalte. *Zeits. f. Wiss. Theol.* Jahrg., 36, II. 2, pp. 161-220.

- MARTI, K. Der Einfluss der Ergebn. d. neuesten alttest. Forschungen auf Religionsgeschichte u. Glaubenslehre. Braunschweig, 1894.....M. 0.75.
- MEIGNAN, CARD. Les Juifs captifs en Chaldée (606-536 B. C.). *Correspondant*, Bd. 171, pp. 3-23.
- NESTLE, E. The Vartorum Septuagint. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 57-61.
- PECHIN, E. Le problème de la vie dans l'Ancien Test. Paris, 1893.
- PETRAU, J. Hat der evang. Christ vor d. kritischen Behandl'g. d. Bibel etwas zu fürchten? Braunschweig, 1893.....M. 1.
- RASSAM, H. The garden of Eden and Biblical Sages. London, 1893.....Is. 6d.
- REY, O. Le système de chronologie biblique de M. M. Chevallier et Dumax. *Rev. bibl.*, 1893, 4, pp. 560-83.
- RIESS, L. Waren die Kinder Israel jemals in Aegypten? *Jahrb.*, LXXIV., pp. 430-48.
- RONGIER, F. Biblia y egiptología. Barcelona. 1893.....Pes. 3.
- SIEGRIST, G. A. L'idée du sacrifice dans l'Ancien Testament. Paris, 1893.
- SPIEKER, G. F. The negative criticism of the Old Testament. *Luth. Ch. Rev.*, Oct., 1893, pp. 335-48.
- VUILLEUMIER, H. Les résultats des travaux les plus récents sur l'Ancien Test. et leur influence sur l'histoire de la religion et sur la dogmatique. *Rev. de theol. et de philos.*, 1893, pp. 241-66; 303-37; 402-23.
- VIGOUROUX, F. Manuel biblique, ou cours d'Ecriture sainte. Ancien Test. 8^e éd., rev. et augm. T. 1^{er}. Introd. générale; Pentateuque. T. 2. Livres historiques, sapientiaux, prophétiques. Paris, 1892-94.
- ZÖCKLER, O. Eden, Ophir, Ephraim. Drei unlösbare u. doch fruchtbare Probleme biblischer Forschung. (Bibl. u. Kirchenhist. Studien von O. Zöckler. Heft 5.) München, 1893.....M. 2.
- PALESTINE.
- SMITH, H. Syrian research since 1886. *Trans. Orient. Congr. at London*, 1892, Vol. II., pp. 402-7.
- DESIMONI, C. Una carta della Terra Santa del secolo XIV. nell' Archivio di stato in Firenze. *Arch. stor. Ital.* Ser. V., T. XI., pp. 241-58.
- JACOBI, KARL. Wandkarte v. Palästina f. die Volkshule. 1:300,000 2 sheets à 59.5×78 centim. Wiesbaden, 1893.
- Eine grosse Reliefkarte von Palästina. *Globus*, LXIV., p. 268.
- Karta öfver Palestina efter "Palestine Expl. Fund's Map of Palestine," och andra källor under medverkan af Magnus Roth utförd vid generalstabens litogr. austalt; Skala 1:200,000, 4 sheets. Stockholm, 1893.
- Voyage d'Elme Adornes à Jérusalem et au mont Sinai, en 1470, texte flamand de Romhoudt de Doppele, publié d'après le MS. original par E. Feys. *Ann. de la soc. démulation pour l'ét. de l'hist. et des antiquités de la Flandre.* Ser. V., T. IV., 1891.
- ALBANY, A. Jérusalem et les sanctuaires de la Judée. Paris, 1894.....Fr. 5.
- BALDENSBERGER, PH. J. Peasant Folklore of Palestine. *Quar. Stat.*, July 1893, pp. 203-19.
- Religion of the Fellahin of Palestine. *Ibid.*, pp. 307-20.
- BALME, FR. La province dominicaine de Terre Sainte de Janvier 1277 à Oct. 1280. *Rev. de d'Or. lat.*, Vol. I., pp. 526-36.
- BAUER, B. Nach dem heilig. Lande. Reise nach Italien, Aegypten u. Pal. 2^{te} Aufl. Radolfzell, 1893.
- BOLTON, H. C. Four weeks in the wilderness of Sinai, with Notes on Egypt. *Bul. Am. Geogr. Soc.*, XXII., 4, pp. 574-98.
- CLERMONT-GANNEAU, C. L'Embouchure du Jourdain dans la Mer Morte. *Acad. inscrip. et belles-lettres: Comp. Rend.*, 4^e, Sér. XXI. p. 14.
- Note on Prof. F. F. Wright's inscribed weight or bead. *Quar. Stat.*, July, 1893, p. 257.
- Note on an ancient weight found at Gaza. *Ibid.*, p. 305 sq.
- CONDER, C. R. Shishak's List. *Ibid.*, p. 245 sq.
- EINSLER, A. Beobachtungen üb. den Ausatz im heiligen Lande. *ZDPV.*, Bd. XVI., pp. 247-55.

- FÉVAL, P. Des villes mortes à la mer. *Rev. Terre Sainte*, X., pp. 220-3; 250-3; 266-9; 285-7; 317-9; 331-4; 344-8; 364-8; 373-5.
- FROHNMEYER, J. Bijbelsche aardrijkskunde. Ite uitgraf. Bewerkt door H. van Zuylen. Zwolle, 1893. Fr. 1.60.
- HALÉVY, J. L'état de Palestine avant l'Exode. *Actes VIII. Congr. Orient.*, Sect. sémin. (II.), pp. 141-52.
- HARPER, H. A. and GEIKIE, C. Bildergrüsse aus dem heilig. Lande. 400 orig. illustr. Charlottenberg, 1893.
- HURWITZ, I. על ארמת עמי. Warsaw, 1893.
- MUEHLAU, F. Beiträge zur Pal. literatur im Ausschluss an Röhrichts Bibliotheca geog. Pales. *ZDPV.*, Bd. XVI., pp. 209-34.
- MURRAY, A. S. Note on the inscription found at Tabitha near Jaffa. *Quar. Stat.*, Oct., 1893, p. 300.
- RÖHRICHT, R. Zur Bibliotheca geog. Palestinae. *ZDPV.*, XVI., pp. 269-96.
- SCHICK, C. Neu aufgedeckte Gräber in Jerusalem. *ZDPV.*, XVI., pp. 202-5.
- Jerusalem nach Ps. 122:3. *Ibid.*, pp. 206-8.
- Die Baugeschichte der Stadt Jerusalem in kurzem Umrissen von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart dargestellt. *Ibid.*, pp. 237-46.
- SCHUMACHER, G. Ergebnisse meiner Reise durch Hauran, 'Adschlün u. Belka. *ZDPV.*, XVI., pp. 153-70.

GENERAL INDEX.

A Critical Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch.....	122
Assyriological Notes.....	196
Barton, Prof. George A., The Semitic Istar Cult.	1
—— Notes.....	202
Book Notices: Bezold's Oriental Diplomacy, 107; Harper's Assyrian Letters, 108; Erman's Egypt, 208; A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language, 212.	
Contributed Notes: Corrections to the text of the Monolith of Shalmanesar as given in "Hebraica," II., No. 3, 106.	
Craig, Prof. James A., Prayer of the Assyrian King Asurbanipal (cir. 650 B. C.).....	75
Critical Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, A.....	122
Derenbourg, Hartwig, Livre intitulé Laisa, sur les Exceptions de la Langue Arabe, par Ibn Khâlôûya, dit Ibn Khâlawaihi. Texte Arabe publié d'après le manuscrit unique du British Museum.....	98
External Evidence of the Exodus, The.....	159
Harper, Prof. Robert F., Assyriological Notes.....	196
Jastrow, Prof. Morris, Jr., Mušannîtu(m).....	193
Livre intitulé Laisa, sur les Exceptions de la Langue Arabe, par Ibn Khâlôûya, dit Ibn Khâlawaihi. Texte Arabe publié d'après le manuscrit unique du British Museum.....	88
Margolis, Prof. Max L., Notes on Semitic Grammar.....	188
Mušannîtu(m).....	193
Notes.....	202
Notes on Semitic Grammar..	188
On the Hebrew Element in Slavo-Judæo-German.....	175
Paton, Prof. Lewis B., The Relation of Lev. xx. to Lev. xvii.-xix.....	111

Prayer of the Assyrian King Asurbanipal (cir. 650 B. C.).....	75
Relation of Lev. XX. to Lev. XVII.-XIX., The.....	111
Schmidt, Prof, Nathaniel, The External Evidence of the Exodus.....	159
Semitic Bibliography.....	218
Semitic Istar Cult, The.....	1
The External Evidence of the Exodus.....	159
The Relation of Lev. XX. to Lev. XVII.-XIX.....	111
The Semitic Istar Cult.....	1
Watson, Rev. W: Scott, A Critical Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch.....	122
Wiener, Leo, On the Hebrew Element in Slavo-Judæo-German.....	175